PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

THIRD SESSION OF THE FOU[illegible] COUNCIL

Vol. LXII (Nos. 1 to 4.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tuesday, the 2nd August 1932.

[illegible] COLLEGE [illegible] No. 29382 19 SEP 1933 COIMBATORE

	PAGES
Personnel of the Government of Madras	1–10
Members present	11–12
I. Swearing in of members	12
II. Address by His Excellency the Governor	12–15
III. Questions and Answers	15–50, 103–117
IV. Acts assented to by His Excellency the Governor	50
V. Panel of Chairmen	50
VI. Election of five members to the Senate of the Annamalai University	51
VII. House Committee	51
VIII. Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1932–33 :—	
Grant VI—Irrigation (excluding Cauvery-Mettur Project)—Reserved	51–53
Grant XXI—Agriculture—Transferred	53–58
Grant XXIX—Civil Works—Transferred and Reserved	58
Grant XXXII—Famine Relief—Reserved	58–69
IX. The Orissa Committee Report	69–98
X. Papers laid on the table of the House	99–102, 118–155

VERIFIED 9 OCT 1990

Wednesday, the 3rd August 1932.

Members present	157–158
I. Questions and Answers	158–187, 244–245
II. House Committee	187

Non-official Business.

III. The Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill (Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar)	188–202, 213–243
IV. A Bill to amend the Madras Medical Registration Act, 1914 (Mr. Daniel Thomas)	202–205
V. A Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920 (Mr. F. Birley)	205–208
VI. A Bill to amend the Madras Impartible Estates Act, 1904 (Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo)	208
VII. The Kapileswarapuram Impartible Estates Bill (Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami)	208
VIII. The Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill (Mr. R. M. Palat)	208
IX. The Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill (The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri)	208

	PAGES
X. A Bill to amend the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920 (S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur)	209
XI. The Kapileswarapuram Impartible Estates Bill (The Zamindar of Mirzapuram)	209
XII. The Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill (The Zamindar of Kirlampudi)	209
XIII. The Money-lenders Bill (Mr. C. Basu Dev)	209–210
XIV. The Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill (Mr. K. Kesava Ramamurthi Nayudu)	210
XV. The Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill (Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar)	210
XVI. The Artisans' Bill (Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar)	210–211
XVII. A Bill to amend the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920 (Mr. P. C. Moses)	211
XVIII. The Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill (Mr. P. Madhusoodhanan Thangal)	211
XIX. The Artisans' Bill (Mr. H. M. Jagannadham)	211
XX. A Bill to amend the District Municipalities Act, 1920 (Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar)	211
XXI. The Artisans' Bill (Pandit Ganala Ramamurthi)	211
XXII. Resolution on matters of general public interest: Service of copyists and copyist-examiners in the Revenue courts	212–213
XXIII. Papers laid on the table of the House	243

Thursday, the 4th August 1932.

Members present	247–248
I. Questions and Answers	248–269, 329–330
II. Act assented to by His Excellency the Governor-General	269
III. The Orissa Committee Report	269–310
IV. A Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920 ..	311–315
V. A Bill to amend the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920	315
VI. A Bill to amend the Madras Services Commission Act, 1929	315–328
VII. Election of five Members to the Senate of the Annamalai University.	328
VIII. Paper laid on the table of the House	328

Friday, the 5th August 1932.

Members present	331–332
I. Questions and Answers	332–359, 401–416
II. Statement regarding the health of Mr. Subash Chandra Bose (a State prisoner)	359–360
III. Statement regarding the alleged oppression of the depressed classes in the Devakottai subdivision	361
IV. Alleged delay in answering questions put to Government	361
V. The Orissa Committee Report—Elucidation of certain incidents that occurred on the previous day at division time	361–362

Non-official Business—Bill.

VI. The Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill (Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar)	362–370
VII. Resolutions on matters of general public interest—Service of copyists and copyist-examiners in the Revenue courts ..	370–375

PAGES

VII. Resolutions on matters of general public interest—*cont.*
Classification of Madigas, Chuckliyans, etc., as Arundhathiyas in Government records 376–377, 378
Establishment of a Central Co-operative Artisan Bank 378–380
Organization of a State lottery on the lines of the Irish Free State Lottery 380–395
Cancellation of certain Government Orders regarding the distribution of discharged temporary employees in the Cauvery-Mettur Project among the regular circles of the Public Works Department 396–400
VIII. Election of a member to the Senate of the Madras University 377
IX. Appointment of Chairmen of Select Committees on certain Bills .. 377
X. Papers laid on the table of the House 400, 416–420

INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

THIRD SESSION OF THE FOURTH LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Volume LXII.

2nd to 5th August 1932.

PAGES

A

" A " class prisoners—
  Question *re* treatment of — in the General Hospital 178

Abdul Hamid Khan, Mr.—
  Bill—
    Medical Registration Amendment Bill 203–204
    Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 192–193, 228
  Orissa Committee Report, consideration of — .. .. 7)
  Resolution *re* Mettur Project, certain temporary officers of the 397–393
    State lottery, organization of a — 388–38
  See Questions and Answers.

Acts assented to by His Excellency the Governor—
  Co-operative Societies Act 50
  Cotton Control Act 50

Acts assented to by His Excellency the Governor-General—
  Cotton Control Act 269

Agenda—
  Motion for adjournment of certain items on an — 375, 395

Agriculture—
  Demand for supplementary grant *re* — 53–58

Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar, Sir—
  Bills—
    Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 236–238, 241–242

Allowances and intermediary posts—
  See Papers laid on the Table.

Amanikere tank—
  Question *re* level of — 254–255

Annamalai University—
  Election to the Senate of — 51, 328

Appendicitis—
  See " Civil Disobedience Prisoners."

Appropriations (non-voted)—
  See Papers laid on the table.

Arasu, Mr. V. T.—
  Bill—
    District Municipalities (Amendment) Bill (No-confidence motions) .. 312–315
    Madras Services Commission (Amendment) Bill 316–317, 324, 326–327
    Medical Registration (Amendment) Bill 204–205
    Moneylenders' Bill 209
    Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 223–224, 231
  Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the 75–76, 289–292
  Questions, delay in answering 361
  See Questions and Answers.

Armstrong, Mr. G. G.—
  Question *re* Leave allowance, excess payment to — 173–174

PAGES

A—cont.

Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur R. N.—
Bills—
Madras Services Commission (Amendment) Bill 317, 319, 322
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill— .. 191, 200–201, 217, 220, 235, 236
Demand for supplementary grant *re* —
Agriculture— 53–55, 57
Famine Relief 59–61, 68
Irrigation 52–53
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — 292–295, 302–303
Resolution *re* state lottery, organization of a — 393
Statement *re* Depressed classes of Devakottai, alleged oppression of 361

Artisans' Bill—
See Bills.

Arundhathiyas—
Resolution re classification of Madigas, etc., as — 376–378

Attluri-Jayaramayya—
See Jayaramayya of Vanapamalu.

B

"B" class prisoners—
Question *re* — in Vellore Jail .. .. 2[illegible]

Bapirazu, Mr. N.—
Question *re* Application of — to appear for B.L. examination while in prison 252–253

Basheer Ahmed Sayeed, Mr.—
Bill—
Madras Services Commission (Amendment) Bill 318–319
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 188–189, 197–199
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — 73–75, 282–284, 310
See Questions and Answers.

Basu Dev, Mr. C.—
Moneylenders' Bill 209–210

Beating persons while in the lock-up—
Question *re* — at Bezwada 250–251
" — at Washermanpet 19–20

Beating of picketers—
Question *re* in Bezwada 351
" at Bapatla .. .. 35[illegible]
" in Kambakone village 335–336
" in Mangalore 15–18
See "Kunhambu Adiyodi"; "Picketers"; "Raman, P."

Bellary district—
Question *re* economic distress in — 44
" relief works in — 45–46

Bethamangalam tank—
Question *re* water-pumping station at — 253–254

Beyabani Sahib Bahadur, S. M. K.—
Bill—
Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill .. 206
See Questions and Answers.

Bhanoji Rao, Mr. A. V.—
Orissa Committee Report, *consideration of the* — 78–79, 295–297

Bills—
Artisans' Bill—
Introduced 210–211
District Municipalities and Local Boards (*Amendment*) Bill (*Bus licence fees*) (Mr. F. Birley)—
Referred to Select Committee 205–206

Bills—*cont.*
District Municipalities (Amendment) Bill (No confidence motions) (hon. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu)—
Referred to Select Committee 311–315
District Municipalities (Amendment) Bill (Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar)—
Introduced 211
Impartible Estates (Amendment) Bill—
Introduced 208
Kapileswaram Impartible Estates Bill—
Introduced 208–209
Local Boards (Amendment) Bill (Mr. P. C. Moses)—
Introduced 211
Local Boards (Amendment) Bill (No confidence motions) (The hon. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu)—
Referred to Select Committee 315
Madras Services Commission (Amendment) Bill—
Taken into consideration 315–325
Passed into law 325–328
Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill—
Introduced 208–211
Medical Registration (Amendment) Bill—
Taken into consideration 202–203
Passed into law 203–205
Moneylenders' Bill—
Introduced 209
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill—
Taken into consideration 188–202, 213–243, 362–364
Passed into law 364–370

Birley, Mr. F.—
Bills—
District Municipalities and Local Boards (Amendment) Bill 205–208

Bose, Mr. Subash Chandra—
Statement *re* the health of 359–360

Broadcasting—
Question *re* proposals for — in the Presidency 168

Buses—
Question *re* licence fee schedules for — 162–164

Buttermilk—
Question *re* supply of — to prisoners 178–180

C

Campbell, the hon. Sir Archibald—
Bills—
Madras Services Commission (Amendment) Bill 315–319
Demand for supplementary grant *re*—
Famine relief 58–59, 66–69
Irrigation 51–53
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — 69–73, 80–81, 311
Resolution *re* copyists in revenue courts 212–213

Cart-track leading to Kanekal—
Question *re* construction of culvert in the — 32

Cattle breeding stations—
Question *re*—under district boards 344–345
„ number of — in the Presidency 186

Cattle diseases—
Question *re* prevention of — 345

Cattle-fairs—
Question *re* — 344

Cauvery-Mettur Project—
Question *re* temporary employees in — 343–344
Resolution *re* certain temporary officers of the — 396–400

PAGES

C—*cont.*

Central Co-operative Artisan Bank—
Resolution *re* establishment of a — 378–379

Ceramic expert—
Question *re* work done by the — 346–347

Chenat Nair exploitation division—
Audit report of the — 99

Chintalapalle Project—
Question *re* — 31

Chittoor district—
Question *re* Amalgamation of — with North Arcot district 260

Cinchona Department—
Audit report of the — 400

Civil Disobedience Movement—
List of persons who apologized, etc. 400, 417–420
Question *re* expenditure on feeding of Police on account of the — 251
,, political meetings by Government officials to combat the — .. 332–335

See Papers laid on the table.

Civil disobedience prisoners—
Question *re* health of — 336–377
,, prevalence of appendicitis among the — 177–178

Civil Works—
Demand for supplementary grant *re* 58

Commissioner for Government Examinations—
Question *re* appointment of a retired gentleman as Secretary to the .. 262–263

Compulsory elementary education—
Question *re* — 43

Compulsory retirement—

See Jail department.

Congress Procession at Mangalore—
Question *re* dispersal of a — 353–354

Congress Volunteers—
Question *re* handcuffing of — in Mangalore 21–23
,, Police excesses on —, petition to Collector of South Kanara *re* — 183–184

Co-operative Department—
Question *re* representation of Muslims in the higher grades of the — .. 160–162

Co-operative Societies Act
Governor's assent to — 50

Copyists—
Resolution *re* the service of — 212–213, 370–375

Cotton Control Act
Governor's assent to — 50
Governor-General's assent to — 269
Question *re*— 338

Cow-slaughter—
Question *re* prohibition of — in municipalities 48
Question *re* statistics *re* — 47

Cumbum tank—
Question *re* ryots under the —, grievances of — 256–257

Cyclone—
See "Malabar", "Kasaragod".

PAGES

D

Daniel Thomas—
Bill—
Medical Registration (Amendment) Bill 202–204
Demand for supplementary grant re—
Agriculture (Lower Bhavani Project) 53–58
Civil Works 58
Famine Relief 58–69
Irrigation 51–53
Depressed classes—
Alleged oppression of the — of Devakottah 357–359, 361
Deputy Inspectors—
Question re— 345
Devakottah—
See Depressed classes.
District Medical Officer of South Kanara—
Question re— 348–349
District Municipalities (Amendment) Bill—
See Bills.
District Municipalities and Local Boards (Amendment) Bill—
See Bills.

E

Education Department—
Question re retrenchment in the —, extent of — 158
" Inspecting Officers of the —, overdrawal of fixed travelling allowance by the — 263–264
Electric Lighting—
Question re — in Mettupalaiyam and Karamadai 350–351
Elementary Education—
Question re — in Tindivanam, etc., taluks 347–348
Ellore Police—
Question re —, ladies under unlawful custody 20–21
Europeans—
Question re state aid to — for special study abroad 99, 119
Excise Department—
Question re Memorial from the menials of the — for change in their appellation 159
Question re "height" exemption to clerks of the — 340–341
Excise Sub-Inspectors—
Question re 348
Exemption—
See "Excise Department", "Retirement".

F

Famine Relief—
Demand for supplementary grant re— 58–69
Question re — in Bellary district 33–34
Famine Relief Fund—
Question re utilization of the— 187
Finance Committee—
Proceedings of the 99, 100, 137
Fixed travelling allowance—
Question re overdrawal of — by the inspecting officers of the Educational department 263–264
Floods—
See Papers laid on the table.

PAGES

F—*cont.*

Fodder-supply—
Question *re* — in Government forests 342

Forest panchayats—
Question *re* list of — in North Arcot district working on a deficit balance .. 266–267
,, number of — in North Arcot district 265–266

Forest Satyagrahis—
Question *re* arrest of — in Herur forest 184
,, ill-treatment of — in Herur forest 184

Forest Utilization Division, Madras—
Audit report of the — 100

Franchise Committee—
See Papers laid on the Table.

Fruit culture—
Question *re* — 40–42

G

Ganapathi Ayyar, Mr. R.—
See District Medical Officer, South Kanara.

General Hospital—
Question *re* treatment in the — of "A" class prisoners 178

Gopalaswami Ayyangar, Mr. N.—
Appointed Member of Motor Vehicles Taxation Enquiry Committee .. 99

Gopalaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur, M.—
Bill—
Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill— .. 210
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devastanams Bill 232
See Questions and Answers.

Government Examinations—
See Commissioner for Government Examinations.

Government Fisheries Cannery—
See Papers laid on the table.

Government Industrial Institute, Madura—
See Papers laid on the table.

Governor, His Excellency the—
Address to the Legislative Council by — 12–15

H

Health—
Question *re* book on — for use in schools 265

High level channel—
Question *re* utilization of water from — for irrigating the Murungapatti area 267

House Committee—
Election to the 51, 187

Herur forest—
Question *re* forest satyagrahis in — 184

High level channel scheme—
Question *re* progress of the — 168–169

Hindu Religious Endowments Act—
Question *re* amendment of the — 167

Hygiene—
Question *re* compilation of a text-book on — 265

PAGES

I

mpartible Estates (Amendment) Bill—
See Bills.

nams—
See Service inams.

ndian medicine—
Question *re* opening a Central store of — 49
See School of Indian Medicine.

ndian Roads, etc., Association—
Question *re* memorandum of the — 37

ndriah, Mr. C.—
See Questions and Answers.

ndustrial Engineering Workshop—
See Papers laid on the table.

nfant mortality—
Question *re* — in Nandyal municipality 36

nspecting officers—
See Education department.

Inspector-General of Prisons—
See Office of the Inspector-General of Prisons.

Irrigation—
Demands for supplementary grant *re*— 51–53

Irrigation Board—
See Nandyal tanks.

J

Jagannatham, Mr. H. M.—
Bills—
Artisans Bill 211
Resolution *re* Arundhathiyas, classification of Madigas, etc., as — .. 376–378

Jail department—
Question *re* compulsory retirement of officers in the — 174–175
See Test auditor.

Jail industries—
Question *re* employment of machinery in — 27–28

Jails—
Question *re* supply of butter-milk in — 178–180

James, Mr. F. E.—
Bill.
Madras Services Commission Amendment Bill 319, 324, 326, 327
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 217–218
See Questions and Answers.

Jayaramayya of Vanapamula—
Question *re* severe beating of 336

K

Kachangurichi temple—
Question *re* administration of the — 261

Kangundi Kuppam Zamindari—
Question *re* transfer of — from North Arcot to Chittoor 268–269

Kapileswaram Impartible Estates Bill—
See Bills.

Kasaragod taluk—
Question *re* cyclone in 35

Kattalai—
Question *re* collection of — by the Zamindar of Udayarpalaiyam 259

Kerala Soap Institute—
See Papers laid on the table.

PAGES

K—*cont.*

Khadi Depot at Nidadavole—
Question *re* search of — 21

Kolanda Reddi, Rao Sahib C.—
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — 77–78, 305, 306
Resolution *re* Mettur Project, certain temporary officers of the — 396–397, 399–400

Kothapalle tank—
Question *re* — 30–31

Koti Reddi, Mr. K.—
Bill—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 193–194, 213–214
Demand for supplementary grant *re*—
Famine Relief 61–62
Lower Bhavani Project 57–58
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — 78, 284–289, 307–308

Krishnan Nayar, The Hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M.—
Bill.
Madras Services Commission Amendment Bill 324
Resolution *re* Arundhathiyas, classification of Madigas, etc., as — 378
State lottery, organization of a — 385, 393–394
Statement *re* the health of Mr. Subash Chandra Bose 359–360

Krishnaswami Mudaliyar, B. of Arni—
Question *re* classification of — as "C" class prisoner 43

Kunhambu *Adiyodi*—
Question *re* beating of — by the Reserve Police, South Kanara 181–183

L

Labour Commission—
See Royal Commission on Labour.

Ladies under unlawful custody—
See Ellore police.

Lakshmana Reddi, Mr. G.—
Demand for supplementary grant *re*—
Famine Relief 65–66
See Questions and Answers.

Lathi charge—
Question *re* — at Bezwada 351–352
" — at Bhimavaram 356
" — at Tanuku 355
See Papers laid on the table.

Lathis.
Question *re* instruction *re* the use of — 23

Law College, Madras—
Question *re* vice-Principalship of the — 263

Leave allowance—
See Armstrong, Mr. G. G.

Legislative Council—
Governor's Address to the — 12–15

L.I.Ms.—
Question *re* appointment of — by local bodies 37–38
Question *re* registration of — 49
Question *re* supervision of — 49

Licence fee schedules—
Question *re* District Board — for buses sanctioned since January 1932 .. 162–164

Live-stock—
Question *re* enumeration of — 46

Live-stock section of the Agricultural Department—
Question *re* expenditure on the — 344

PAGES

L—cont.

Local Boards—
See Bills.
See Papers laid on the table.

Local Bodies—
No-confidence motions in — 311–315

Lottery—
Resolution *re* organisation of a — by the State 380–395

Lower Bhavani Project—
Demand for supplementary grant *re* — 53–58

M

Madanagopal Nayudu, Mr. R.—
Bill—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 237
Resolution *re* Arundhathiyas, classification of— 378

Madhusoodanan Thangal, Mr. P.—
Bill—
Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill — Bill introduced 211

Madras Cotton Control Act—
See Cotton Control Act, 1932.

Madras Port Staff Club—
Question *re* expenditure on the — 174

Madras Services Commission (Amendment) Bill—
See Bills.

Madras Services Commission Report—
Laid on the table 328

Madras University—
Election of two members to the senate of the — 377

Mahboob Ali Baig, Mr.—
See Questions and Answers.

Malabar—
Question *re* cyclone in — 32–33

Mal-mimal village—
Question *re* repairs to the river channel in the — 256

Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill—
See Bills.

Manikkavelu Nayakar, Mr.—
Bill—
District Municipalities and Local Boards (Amendment) Bill 208
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 194, 231–232

Medical Registration Amendment Bill—
See Bills.

Melchangam village—
Question *re* construction of a thangal in the — 26

Menials—
See Excise department.

Mettur taluk—
Exclusion of — from Salem and Coimbatore District Boards 101

Miran Sahib Bahadur, Mr. Ahmed—
Bill—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 196

Money lenders' Bill—
See Bills.

Moses, Mr. P. C.—
Bills—
Local Boards Amendment Bill 211
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — 93–94

PAGES

M—*cont.*

Motor transport—
Question *re* condition of — in the Presidency 164–165

Motor vehicles—
Question *re* number of — licensed in 1931–32 and income therefrom .. 165

Motor vehicles, etc.—
See Papers laid on the table.

Mount Stuart Working Circle—
Audit report of — 100

Muniswami Nayudu, the hon. Diwan Bahadur B—

Bills—
District Municipalities (Amendment) Bill (No. 9 of 1932, *re* no-confidence motions) referred to Select Committee 311–312, 314
Local Boards (Amendment) Bill (no-confidence motions) referred to Select Committee 315
Madras Services Commission (Amendment) Bill 320–321
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 200, 237–241

Muniswami Pillai, Rao Sahib V. I.—

Bill—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill.. 226

Resolution *re* Arundhathiyas, classification of Madigas, etc., as — 377
See Questions and Answers.

Murungapettai area—
Question *re* water from High Level Channel for irrigating the — 267

Muslim Education Committee—
Question re Report of the — 158–159

Muslim schools—
Question *re* — in Saidapet municipality 340

Muslims—
Question *re* representation of — in the Co-operative department 160–162

Muthiah Chettiyar, Mr. M. A.—

Bills—
District Municipalities (Amendment) Bill (no-confidence motions) .. 313–314
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 366–367

N

Nachiappa Gounder, Mr. K. A.—
Resolution *re* copyists in revenue courts 370–371
See Questions and Answers.

Nandyal Municipality—
Question *re* extension of — 36–37
,, finances of the — 260–261
See Infant mortality.

Nandyal tanks—
Question *re* Irrigation Board for — 256

Narasimhaswami, Mr. D. V.—

Bill—
Kapileswaram Impartible Estates Bill—Introduced 208

Narayanaswami Pillai, Rao Bahadur T. M.—
See Questions and Answers.

Nilambur Forests Division—
See Papers laid on the table.

No-confidence motions in Local Bodies—
Bills *re* — 311–315

North Arcot district—
Question *re* amalgamation of — with the Chittoor district 260

PAGES

O

Oath of office—
Jones, Mr. C. E. 12
Pannirselvam, Rao Bahadur A. T. 12
Peddi Raju, Mr. P. 12
Stanes, Mr. F. J. 12

Office of the Inspector-General of Prisions—
Question re shifting of the — 23–24

Oomen, Dr.—
Question re misconduct of — 349–350
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — 69–98, 269–310

P

Palar Basin—
Question re tanks in the — 254–256

Palat, Mr. R. M.—
Bill—
Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill .. 208
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — 297–299
See Questions and Answers.

Panchayats—
See Papers laid on the Table.

Panel of Chairmen—
Announcement re — 50

Pannirselvam, Rao Bahadur A. T.—
Bill—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill — 227–228

Papers laid on the Table re—
Alleged locking up of some persons by the Police Commissioner, Madras, before the arrival of the Franchise Committee 144
Appropriations (non-voted) 243
Chenat Nair Exploitation Division, audit report of the — 99
Cinchona Department, audit report of the — 400
Civil disobedience movement, list of persons who apologized and were left off 400, 417–420
Commissioner's enquiry into the beating of Messrs. Subba Rao and Ramaswami 152
District and taluk boards, date of retirement of members of certain— .. 101, 149
Finance Committee, proceedings of the — 99, 100, 137
Floods in Ganjam, etc., districts, report on — 99, 119–125
Floods in Tinnevelly, etc., districts, report on — 99, 125–131
Forest Utilization Division, Madras, audit report of the — 100
Franchise Committee, arrest of certain persons prior to the arrival of the— 144–145
Government Fisheries Cannery, Chaliyam, audit report of the — 99
Government Industrial Institute, Madura, audit report of the— 99
Government Order re production of licences on demand, etc. 100
Gudivada police, treatment of certain volunteers by the — 143, 146, 147
Industrial Engineering Workshop, audit report of the — 102
Kasaragod police, signatories to the complaint against the — 145–146
Kasaragod police, treatment of volunteers by the — 100, 134
Kerala Soap Institute, audit report of the — 102
Kistna anicut and irrigation in Repalle taluk 99, 118
Lathi charge by the police at Ponur (Guntur district) 150–151
Lathi charge at Rajapalayam 99, 131–132
Local boards, date of retirement of members of certain— 99, 102, 243
Madras Services Commission, report for 1931–32 328
Madura police, treatment of Congress volunteers by the — 140–142
Mettur taluk, exclusion from Salem and Coimbatore District Boards .. 101
Motor vehicles—
Tax concessions to certain — 99, 100, 102
Taxation Enquiry Committee, appointment of Mr. N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar as a member of — 99
Mount Stuart Working Circle, audit report of the — 100
Nilambur Forests Division, audit report of the — 102

PAGES

P—*cont.*

Papers laid on the Table *re*—*cont.*
Panchayats, date of retirement of members of certain — .. 100, 138, 139, 148
Posts of Rs. 500 per mensem and above 100, 135–136
Prabhu, Mrs., police escort to Vellore for — 150
Public Accounts Committee and Finance Committee, proceedings of — .. 100, 137
M. Ramakotayya, treatment by the police of volunteer — 142
Resolutions passed by the Council, action taken on — 102, 153–155
Retrenchment Committee, recommendations of the — regarding allowances and intermediary posts 152
Robertsonpeta police, treatment of certain volunteers by the — .. 100, 139–140
South Kanara police, cost of feeding — 99, 132
State aid to Europeans for special study abroad 99, 119
Subba Rao and Ramaswami, Messrs. — Commissioner's enquiry into the beating of — 152
Tammareddi Nagareddi, beating of — 100, 133
Test works, Bellary, wages earned on — 400, 416
Ushamani and Kousalya Devi, Srimathis — detention of as in-patients .. 100, 133
Veerayya, P. and Sreeramulu, G., lathi charge on — 153

Parthasarathi Ayyangar, Mr. C. R.—
Bill—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 240–241

Patnaick Mahasayo, Sriman M. G.—
Bills—
Impartible Estates Amendment Bill—Bill Introduced 208
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 215, 221–222, 239
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — .. 69–70, 79–80, 96–98, 269–282, 303, 306, 307
Resolution *re* State lottery, organization of a — 387–388
Statement *re* certain incidents which happened at a division on the Orissa Committee Report 361–362
See Questions and Answers.

Patro, Sir A. P.—
Bill—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 189–191, 220–221, 238, 367–369

Pennar bridge—
Question *re* flood discharge in the — 267

Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Prisons—
Question *re* abolition of the post of — 175–177

Petition—
See Police excesses.

Picketers—
Question *re* beating of picketers at Bezwada 16–17, 183
,, beating of picketers at Mangalore 354–355
,, detention of — in the lock-up at Mangalore 354
See Papers laid on the Table.

Pocker Sahib, Mr. B.—
See Questions and Answers.

Police—
Question *re* beating by the — at the Bezwada lock-up 250–251
,, expenditure on the feeding of the — on account of civil disobedience movement 251

Police excesses—
Question *re* petition to Collector of South Kanara *re* — on Congress volunteers 183–184
,, at Kanhangad 18–19
,, at Robertsonpet.. 20

Police officers—
Question *re* complaints against — number, nature and disposal of — .. 185

Political meetings by Government officials—
Question *re* — 32–33

PAGES

P—*cont.*

Political prisoners —
Question *re* number of — admitted into and released from jails in the current year 253

Posts on Rs. 500 and above, etc. —
See Papers laid on the Table.

Prabhu, Mrs. L. S.—
Question *re* the return of her *thali* 180–181, 249–250

President, the hon. the —
Announcement *re* —
Appointments of chairmen of certain Select Committees 377
Election of two members to the Madras University Senate 377
Bills—
Madras Services Commission (Amendment) Bill 319, 323, 324, 327
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 192, 202, 213
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — 70, 81–83, 272, 278, 300–303, 306
Questions, discussion *re* delay in answering — 361
Statement *re* certain incidents which happened at a division on the Orissa Committee Report 362
See Rulings.

Prisoners—
Question *re* supply of buttermilk to — 178–180

Probationary Revenue Inspectors—
Question *re* appointment of — as Deputy Tahsildars 32

Provident Fund—
Question *re* contribution to the — by the municipal employees of Mangalore 47

Public Accounts Committee—
Proceedings of the — 100, 137

Q

Quay dues—
Question *re* — in Madras Port Trust 28–30

Questions—
Discussion *re* delay in answering — 361

Questions and Answers—

Abdul Hameed Khan, Mr.—
Question *re* Bapiraju, Mr. N. — application to appear for B.L. examination 252–253
,, Excise sub-inspectors 348
,, Law College, Madras, filling up of Vice-Principalship of — .. 263
,, Muslim Education Committee, report of the — 158–159
,, Muslim Schools in Saidapet Municipality 340
,, personnel of the Text-Book Committee 338–340
,, Secretary to the Commissioner for Government Examinations, appointment of a retired gentleman as 262–263

Arasu, Mr. V. T.—
Question *re* Cotton Control Act, 1932 338
,, Excise department, memorial from menials, for change in their appellation 159
,, Zamindar of Udaiyarpalaiyam, collection of kattalai by the— 259
,, Zamindar of Udaiyarpalaiyam, police help to the — 185–186

Basheer Ahmed Sayeed, Mr.—
Question *re* compulsory elementary education 43
,, Elementary education in Tindivanam, etc., taluks 347–348
,, Jail department, compulsory retirement of officers in the — . 174–175
,, Muslims, representation in the Co-operative department .. 160–162
,, office of the Inspector-General of Prisons, shifting of the —.. 23–24
,, Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Prisons, abolition of the post of — 175–177

PAGES

Q—*cont.*

Questions and Answers—*cont.*

Basheer Ahmed Sayeed, Mr.—*cont.*
Question *re* Probationary Revenue Inspectors, appointment of — as Deputy Tahsildars 32
„ religious and charitable service inams 169–172, 257–258
„ retrenchment in the Jail department 24
„ test auditor for the Jail department 24–25

Bayappa Reddi, Mr. P. —
Question *re* school assistants and deputy inspectors 345

Beyabani Sahib Bahadur, S. M. K.—
Question *re* Cumbum tank, grievances of ryots under the — 256–257

Gopalaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur M.—
Question *re* economic distress in the Bellary district 44
„ Famine Relief Fund, utilization of — 187
„ relief works in Bellary district 45–46
„ Tungabhadra Project 267–268

Indriah, Mr. C.—
Question *re* acquittal of Mr. Somayajulu, Narasapur 356–357
„ lathi charge at Bhimavaram 356
„ lathi charge at Tanuku 355

James, Mr. F. E.—
Question *re* licence fee schedules for buses sanctioned since January 1932 162–164

Lakshmana Reddi, Mr. G.—
Question *re* Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars, Anantapur district — appointment of outsiders as 46

Mahboob Ali Baig, Mr. —
Question *re* temporary employees — Cauvery-Mettur Project 343–344

Muniswami Pillai, Rao Sahib V. I.—
Question *re* depressed classes of Devakottai, oppression of the — .. 357–359

Nachiyappa Gounder, Mr. K. A.—
Question *re* toddy and arrack shops, reopening of — in Tiruchengodu, etc., taluks 341–342

Narayanaswami Pillai, Rao Bahadur T. M.—
Question *re* High Level channel, water for irrigating the Murungapettai area 267

Palat, Mr. R. M.—
Question *re* cyclone in Malabar 32–33

Patnaik Mahasayo, Sriman M.G.—
Question *re* inspecting officers of the Educational department, overdrawal of fixed travelling allowance by the — 263–264

Pocker Sahib, Mr. B.—
Question *re* Armstrong, Mr. G. G.—excess payment of leave allowance to —. 173–174
„ Kachangurichi temple, administration of the — 261
„ Madras Port Staff Club, expenditure on the — 174
„ quay dues in Madras Port Trust 28–30

Ramamurti, Pandit Ganala—
Question *re* travelling allowance of honorary organizers of village panchayats 50
„ Visvabrahmans, age-limit for entry into public service .. 46–47

Ramaswami Mudaliyar, Mr. V. M.—
Question *re* Bethamangalam, water-pumping station at — 253–254
„ Chittoor and North Arcot districts, amalgamation of — .. 260
„ Excise sub-inspectors—exemptions to clerks 340–341
„ Mal-mimal village, repairs to the river channel in the — .. 256
„ Palar basin, tanks in the — 254–256
„ Royal Commission on Labour, action taken on the recommendations of the — 248–249

PAGES

Q—*cont.*

Questions and Answers—

Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. A.—

Question *re* Ceramic expert, work done by the — 346–347
,, Chintalapalli project 31
,, Civil disobedience movement, expenditure on feeding of police on account of the — 251
,, construction of a culvert in the cart-track leading to Kanekal 32
,, construction of a culvert for the supply channel from the Hagari river to Kanekal tank 31
,, extension of Nandiyal municipality 36–37
,, famine relief in Bellary district 33–34
,, health of civil disobedience prisoners 336–337
,, Hindu Religious Endowments Act — proposals for amendment of — 167
,, Hygiene, compilation of a text-book on — 265
,, infant mortality in Nandyal 36
,, Irrigation board for Nandyal tanks 256
,, Khadi depot at Nidadavole, search of — 21
,, Kothapalle tank 30–31
,, L.I.Ms. appointment of — by local bodies 37–38
,, Nandyal municipality, finances of — 260–261
,, political meetings by Government officials 332–335
,, political prisoners, number admitted into and released from jails in the current year 253
,, Prescription of a book on health for use in schools 265
,, Ramasagar anicut, dispute regarding — 30
,, rural reconstruction supervisors 36
,, temple committees 38–40
,, village panchayats, inspection of records of — 35

Rangaswami Reddi, Mr, M. B.—
Question *re* central store of Indian medicine 49
,, flood discharge in the Pennar bridge 267
,, forest panchayats in North Arcot district 265–266
,, forest panchayats in north Arcot district working on a deficit balance 266–267
,, ill treatment of women in Vellore Jail 43–44
,, Krishnaswami Mudaliyar, B., of Arni, 'C' class prisoner .. 43
,, registration of L. I. Ms. 49
. School of Indian Medicine—trouble among students 48
,, supervision of L.I.Ms. 49
,, thangal in the Welchangam village, construction of a — .. 36
,, transfer of taluks from North Arcot to South Arcot district. 268–269

Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur C. S.—
Question *re* motor vehicles licensed in 1931-32 and income therefrom .. 165

Sahajanandam, Swami A. S.—
Question *re* Sivaganga, rendition of — 258

Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, Mr.—
Question *re* exemptions from retirement of persons with 30 years of service 172–173
,, police officers, number, nature and disposal of complaints against — 185
,, Prabhu (Mrs.), return of thali belonging to — 180–181
,, Retrenchment Committee, recommendations 337–338
,, Retrenchment in the Educational department 158
,, Subash Chandra Bose, health of — 360

Shetty, Mr. A. B.—
Question *re* 'B' class prisoners in Vellore Jail 25
,, Broadcasting in the Presidency, proposals for — 168
,, electric lighting in Mettupalaiyam and Kasamadai 350–351
,, fruit culture 40–42
,, Indian roads, etc., Association, memorandum of — 37
,, Motor transport in the Presidency, condition of — 164–165

PAGES

Q—*cont.*

Questions and Answers—*cont.*

Shetty, Mr. A. B.—*cont.*

Question *re* Sub-Registry office at Perdal 42
" Temperance Propaganda Committee, disposal of cinema projectors, etc., of — 165–66
" Temple Committees, list of active and defunct — 167–168
" Vellore Jail—Wire-knitted screen between prisoners and interviewers 26
" Veterinary College, number of students who passed the Diploma examinations 162
" Veterinary dispensaries, retrenchment in — 42

Singam Ayyangar, Mr. K.—
Question *re* cattle-breeding operations under district boards 344–345
" cattle-breeding stations in the Presidency 186
" cattle-diseases, prevention of — 345
" cattle fairs in the Presidency 344
" enumeration of livestock 46
" fodder supply in Government forests 342
" high level channel scheme, progress of the — 168–169
" livestock section of the Agricultural Department 344
" prohibition of cow-slaughter in municipalities 48
" slaughter of cattle outside municipal limits 47
" statistics regarding cow-slaughter 47
" Temple Committees, Trichinopoly 338

Sreshta, Mr. M. S.—
Question *re* municipal employees, Mangalore—Provident fund contribution 47

Stanes, Mr. F. J.—
Question *re* jail industries, employment of machinery in — 27–28

Subrahmanya Bhatt, Mr. U. C.—
Question *re* " A " class prisoners, treatment in the General Hospital of —. 178
" Attluri Jayaramayya, beating of — 336
" beating in the lock-up at Bezwada 250–251
" beating of picketeers at Bezwada 250–251, 351, 352–353
" beating of picketeers in Mangalore .. .. 15 to 18, 354–355
" beating of Subbayya and Nabi Sahib at Bapatla 353
" beating of three persons in the Washermanpet Police lock-up. 19–20
" beating of toddy shop picketeers in Kambakone village .. 335–336
" Civil disobedience prisoners, prevalence of appendicitis among the — 177–178
" Congress procession at Mangalore, disposal of — 353–354
" cyclone in Kasaragod taluk 35
" detention of picketeers in the lock-up at Mangalore 354
" District Medical Officer of South Kanara 348–349
" Dr. Oomen, misconduct of — 349–350
" Ellore police—Ladies under unlawful custody 20–21
" forest satyagrahis in Herur forest 184
" handcuffing of Congress volunteers in Mangalore 21–23
" Kunhambu Adiyodi and P. Raman, beating by Reserve Police, South Kanara 181–183
" lathi charges in Bezwada 351–352
" Lathis, amendment in the Police Gazette regarding use of —. 23
" police excesses at Kanhangod 18–19
" police excesses at Robertsonpet 20
" police excesses on Congress Volunteers, petition to Collector of South Kanara 183–184
" reserve forests in South Kanara, withdrawal of grazing privilege in the — 251–252
" Subash Chandra Bose, health of —. 359
" supply of buttermilk to prisoners.. 178–180
" Tahsildar of Mangalore, delay in the disposal of business by —. 258–259
" the *thali* incident at Tellicherry 249–250

PAGES

R

Raja of Bobbili, the—
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — 76–77, 83–85
Raja of Khallikote, the—
Orissa Committee Report, co sideration of the — 76, 85–88

Rajan, the hon. Mr. P. T.—
Demand for supplementary grant regarding Agriculture (Lower Bhavani Project) 53–58
Demand for supplementary grant regarding Civil Works 58
Resolution re Central Co-operative Artisan Bank, establishment of a — .. 379–380

Ramalinga Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur T. A.—
Bill—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 199–200, 224–225, 239–240

Ramamurti, Pandit Ganala—
Bills—
Artisans' Bill — 211
Resolution re Central Co-operative Artisan Bank, establishment of a — .. 378–379
See Questions and Answers.

Raman, P.—
Question re beating of — by the Reserve Police, South Kanara 181–183

Raman Menon, Mr. K. P.—
Bill—
Madras Services Commission (Amendment) Bill 321
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 222–223
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — 85

Ramasagar anicut—
Question re dispute regarding — 30

Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. T. S.—
Bill—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 189–195, 196, 215, 216–217
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — 308–309
Resolution re State lottery, organization of a — 386–387

Ramaswami Mudaliyar, Mr. V. M.—
Bills—
Artisans' Bill 210–211
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 216, 362–363
See Questions and Answers.

Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. A.—
Bills—
District Municipalities (Amendment) Bill 211
Madras Services Commission (Amendment) Bill 317, 319–321, 324
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill— 191
Demand for Supplementary grant re Famine Relief 62–65, 68
· Lower Bhavani Project 55
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — 309
See Questions and Answers.

Rangaswami Reddi, Mr. M. B.—
See Questions and Answers.

Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur C. S.—
Bill—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devastanams Bill 188, 196–197, 214–215, 216, 225–226, 231, 234–237, 241, 363, 364, 369
Demand for supplementary grant re Lower Bhavani Project 55–56
See Questions and Answers.

Repalle Taluk—
Irrigation in 99, 118

Reserve forests—
Question re grazing privilege in the — of South Kanara, withdrawal of — .. 251–252

PAGES

R—*cont.*

Reserve Police—
Question *re* beating of Kunhambu Adiyodi and P. Raman by the South Kanara .. 181–183
Resolution *re* Arundhathiyas, classification of Madigas, etc., as— .. 376–378
,, Central Co-operative Artisan Bank, establishment of a — .. 378–380
,, copyists and copyist-examiners .. 212–213, 370–375
,, Mettur Project, certain temporary officers of the— .. 396–400
,, State lottery, organization of a— .. 380–395

Resolutions passed by the Council—
See Papers laid on the Table.

Retirement—
Question *re* exemptions from the rule *re*—after 30 years' service .. 172–173

Retrenchment—
Question *re* — in the Educational Department .. 158
,, in the Jail Department .. 24

Retrenchment Committee—
Question *re* recommendations of the— .. 337–338

Royal Commission on Labour—
Question *re* action taken on the recommendations of the— .. 248–249

Rulings—
Debate—Procedure—
The Madras Legislative Council is competent to discuss the Orissa Committee Report though the Report refers not only to Madras but to other Provinces as well .. 70
The motion that the further consideration of a Bill (A Bill to amend the Madras Services Commission Act, 1929), be taken up at the next meeting of the Council can be made even after the motion that the Bill be not referred to a select committee but be taken up for consideration has been voted on and passed by the House .. 324
Rule 24-A—
The Local Government can bring in a motion before the Legislative Council for eliciting its opinion under rule 24-A without any reference from the Government of India under section 52, in order to constitute a new Governor's Province .. 70

Rural Reconstruction Supervisors—
Question *re*— .. 36

S

Sahajanandam, Swami A. S.—
Bill.
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill .. 370
See Questions and Answers.

Sami Venkatachalam Chetti—
Bill—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill .. 195, 215–216, 218–220, 233–237, 239–240, 362–386
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — .. 70, 94–96
Resolution *re* State lottery, organization of a — .. 392–393
See Questions and Answers.

Satyanarayana Choudari, Mr. C.—
Bills—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill .. 230–232
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the .. 88–92, 303–304, 305
Resolution *re* Mettur Project, certain temporary officers of the— .. 398–399

School Assistants—
Question *re* — .. 345

School of Indian Medicine —
Question *re* trouble among students of the — .. 48

Service inams—
Question *re* religious and charitable— .. 169–172, 257–258

S—*cont.*

PAGES

Shetty, Mr. A. B.—
Resolution *re* State lottery, organization of a — 384–386
See Questions and Answers.

Simhachalam Pantulu, Mr. G.—
Bills—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 232–233
Orissa Committee Report, consideration of the — 304–305

Singam Ayyangar, Mr. K.—
See Questions and Answers.

Sivaganga—
Question *re* rendition of — 258

Slater, Mr. S. H.—
Demand for supplementary grant *re* —
Lower Bhavani Project 56–57

Slaughter of cattle—
Question *re* — outside municipal limits 47

Somayajulu, Mr. (Narasapur)—
Question *re* acquittal of — 356–357

Sreshta, Mr. M. S.—
Resolution *re* State lottery, organization of a — 380–384, 392
See Questions and Answers.

State lottery—
Resolution *re* organization of a — 380–395

Stokes, The hon. Mr. H. G.—
Resolution *re* State lottery, organization of a — 389–392

Subash Chandra Bose, Mr.—
Statement *re* the health of — 359–360

Subbarayan, Dr. P.—
Bills—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devastanams Bill 229

Subrahmanya Bhatt, Mr. U. C.—
See Questions and Answers.

Sub-Registry office—
Question *re* — at Perdal 42

Supply channel from the Hagari river to the Kanekal tank—
Question *re* construction of a culvert for the — 31

Swastya Raksha—
Question *re* text-book on Hygiene called —, compilation of — 265

T

Tahsildar—
Question *re* delay in disposal of business by the — of Mangalore 258–259

Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars (Anantapur district)—
Question *re* appointment of outsiders as — 46

Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur, Khan Sahib Syed—
Bill—
Medical Registration (Amendment) Bill 205

Temperance Propaganda Committee—
Question *re* disposal of cinema projectors, etc., of the — 165–166

Temple Committees—
Question *re* — 38–40
Question *re* list of active and defunct — 167–168
Question *re* Trichinopoly — 338

Temporary employees—
See Cauvery-Mettur Project.

PAGES

T—*cont.*

Test-auditor—
Question *re* — for the Jail department 24–25

Test Works, Bellary—
Wages earned by men employed on the — 400, 416

Text-book Committee—
Question *re* personnel of the — 338–340

Thali—
Question *re* return of — to Mrs. L. S. Prabhu 180–181, 249–250

Thorne, Mr. J. A.—
Resolution *re* copyists in revenue courts 371–373
Mettur Project, certain temporary officers of the — 398–399

Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill—
See Bills.

Toddy and arrack shops—
Question *re* re-opening of — in *Trichengodu, etc., taluks* 341–342

Transfer of taluks—
Question *re* proposal for — from North Arcot to South Arcot district .. 268–269

Tungabhadra Project—
Question *re* the present stage of the — 267–268

U

Udaiyarpalaiyam—
See Zamindar of Udaiyarpalaiyam.

Usman Sahib, the hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad—
Bill—
Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill 191

V

Vellore Jail—
Question *re* 'B' class prisoners in — 25
,, *re* —, wire-knitted screen between prisoners and interviewers .. 26
,, *re* ill-treatment of women in — 43–44

Venkatagiri, the Kumara Raja of—
Bill—
Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill .. 208

Veterinary College—
Question *re* diploma examinations, number who passed in the — 162

Veterinary dispensaries—
Question *re* —, retrenchment in — 42

Village Panchayats—
Question *re* inspection of records of — 35
,, travelling allowance of honorary organizers of — 50

Viswabrahmans—
Question *re* age-limit for entry into public service 46–47

Volunteers—
Question *re* ill-treatment of — in Bezwada — 352–353
See 'Papers laid on the table'; 'Picketers'; 'Lathi charge'.

Z

Zamindar of Kirlampudi—
Bills—
Mangavanam, etc., Impartible Estates Bill 209

Zamindar of Mirzapuram—
Bills—
Kapileswaram Impartible Estates Bill 209

Zamindar of Udaiyarpalaiyam—
Question *re* collection of kattalai by the — .. .. 25[illegible]
,, police help to the — .. .. [illegible]

PERSONNEL OF THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Governor of Madras.

His Excellency Lieut.-Col. the Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FREDERICK STANLEY, P.C., G.C.I.E., C.M.G. Took his seat on the 12th November 1929.

Members of the Executive Council.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur, *Kt.*, Home Member. Took his seat on the 30th March 1925 and is in charge of the following portfolios :—

I.—Provincial Subjects.

1. Police, including Railway Police and C.I.D.
2. Regulation of betting and gambling.
3. Prevention of cruelty to animals.
4. Control of poisons.
5. Control of vehicles.
6. Control of dramatic performances and cinematographs.
7. Control of newspapers, books and printing presses.
8. Laccadives.
9. European vagrancy.
10. European and Anglo-Indian education.
11. Regulation of medical and other professional qualifications and standards.
12. Government Houses, Staff and equipment of His Excellency the Governor.
13. Government Presses.
14. Elections for Indian and Provincial Legislatures.
15. Industrial matters included under the following heads :—
    - (*a*) Factories.
    - (*b*) Settlement of labour disputes.
    - (*c*) Boilers.
    - (*d*) Gas.
    - (*e*) Smoke nuisances.
    - (*f*) Welfare of labour including depressed classes.
16. Criminal tribes.
17. Stores and Stationery (required for Reserved Departments).

II.—Central Subjects.

1. Control of petroleum and explosives.
2. Central police organization.
3. Arms and ammunition.
4. Emigration and immigration.
5. Pilgrimage to the Hedjaz.

2. The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR, *Kt.*, Law Member. Took his seat on the 25th April 1928 and is in charge of the following portfolios :—

I.—Provincial Subjects.

1. Administration of justice, including constitution, powers, maintenance and organization of courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction within the province.
2. Provincial law reports.
3. Administrator-General and Official Trustees.
4. Escheats.
5. Coroners.
6. Treasure-trove.
7. Non-judicial and judicial stamps.
8. Prisons and prisoners.

I.—Provincial Subjects—cont.

9. Industrial matters included under the following head: Electricity, including hydro-electric scheme.
10. Forests (including Cinchona) except panchayat forests.
11. Minor Ports.

II.—Central Subjects.

1. Civil law.
2. Inventions and designs.
3. Copyright.
4. Criminal law.
5. Major Ports.
6. Shipping and navigation.
7. Lighthouses.
8. Port quarantine and marine hospitals.

3. The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., C.B.E., V.D., I.C.S., Member in charge of Revenue. Took his seat on the 29th June 1929 and is in charge of the following portfolios :—

I.—Provincial Subjects.

1. Land Revenue administration as described under the following heads, namely :—
   - (*a*) Assessment and collection of land revenue.
   - (*b*) Maintenance of land records ; survey for revenue purposes ; records of rights.
   - (*c*) Laws regarding land tenures ; relations of landlords and tenants ; collection of rents.
   - (*d*) Court of Wards, encumbered and attached estates.
   - (*e*) Land improvement and agricultural loans.
   - (*f*) Colonization and disposal of Crown lands.
   - (*g*) Management of Government estates.
   - (*h*) Panchayat forests.
2. Yeomiahs, inams and hereditary pensions.
3. Water-supplies, irrigation and canals, drainage and embankments ; water storage and water power.
4. Inland waterways including shipping and navigation thereon.
5. Economic condition including wages and prices and famine-relief.
6. Land acquisition, excepting notifications under sub-section (1) of section 4 and declarations under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, where the public purpose referred to in the said sub-sections appertains to a transferred subject.
7. Development of mineral resources.
8. Protection of wild birds and animals.
9. Pounds and prevention of cattle trespass.
10. Provincial gazetteers.
11. Agency tracts.
12. Fortnightly reports and preliminary special reports to the Government of India.
13. General service questions.
14. Office procedure.
15. Secretariat.
16. Matters of a general nature not allocated elsewhere.

II.—Central Subjects.

1. Geological survey.
2. Mineral development.
3. Botanical survey.
4. Survey of India.
5. Zoological survey.
6. Meteorology.
7. Census and Statistics.
8. Territorial changes.
9. Immovable property in possession of the Governor-General in Council.
10. All-India services.
11. Public Services Commission.
12. Reforms.

4. The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., Finance Member. Took his seat on the 19th March 1930 and is in charge of the following portfolios :—

I.—Provincial Subjects.

1. Provincial finance.
2. Pensions.
3. Local Fund audit.
4. Preservation and translation of ancient manuscripts.
5. Central Record office.

II.—Central Subjects.

1. (*a*) Defence of India.
   (*b*) Naval and Military works and cantonments.
2. External relations, including naturalization and aliens and pilgrimage beyond India except to the Hedjaz.
3. Relations with States in India.
4. Political charges.
5. Communications.
6. Posts and telegraphs and telephones, including wireless installations.
7. Sources of all-India revenues.
8. Currency and coinage.
9. Public debt of India.
10. Savings banks.
11. Indian Audit Department.
12. Commerce, including Banks and Insurance.
13. Trading Companies and other Associations.
14. Opium (Central questions regarding —).
15. Central Research.
16. Ecclesiastical.
17. Archæology.
18. Regulation of ceremonial titles, orders, precedence and civil uniform.
19. Subjects not allocated elsewhere.

Ministers.

1. The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU, Minister for Local Self-Government. Took his seat on the 27th October 1930 and is in charge of the following portfolios :—

1. Local Self-Government including village panchayats.
2. Medical administration.
3. Public Health and Sanitation and Vital Statistics.
4. Religious and Charitable Endowments.
5. Adulteration of food-stuffs and other articles.
6. Light and Feeder Railways and Tramways within municipal areas.
7. Stores and Stationery (required for Transferred Departments).

2. The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN, Minister for Public Works. Took his seat on the 27th October 1930 and is in charge of the following portfolios :—

1. Agriculture.
2. Civil Veterinary Department.
3. Public Works (Buildings, Roads, Ferries, Ropeways, etc.).
4. Co-operative Societies.
5. Registration.
6. Weights and Measures.

3. The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR, Minister for Education and Excise. Took his seat on the 27th October 1930 and is in charge of the following portfolios :—

1. Education (other than European and Anglo-Indian education).
2. Excise.
3. Development of Industries.
4. Fisheries.
5. Libraries, Museums and Zoological Gardens.
6. Pilgrimage within British India.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

President.

The hon. Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI.

Deputy President.

M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur G. JAGANNADHA RAJU Garu.

Panel of Chairmen.

M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur A. T. PANNIRSELVAM Avargal.
,, Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR Avargal.
,, M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR Avargal.
ABDUL HAMEED KHAN SAHIB Bahadur.

Secretary to the Council.

M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR Avargal, B.A., M.L.

Assistant Secretary to the Council.

M.R.Ry. D. K. V. RAGHAVA VARMA Garu, B.A., B.L.

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
1. Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.	Madras City, Muhammadan Urban.
2. Ahmed Meeran Sahib Bahadur, Moulvi Hafeez Anumanthakudi Mustapha.	Ramnad *cum* Tinnevelly, Muhammadan Rural.
3. Alagannan Chettiyar, Rao Sahib A. S.	Madura, N.-M. Rural.
4. Alamelumangathayaramma, Mrs. K.	NOMINATED.
5. Annamalai Chettiyar, S. A. A.	Nattukottai Nagarathar's Association.
6. Arasu, V. T.	NOMINATED.
7. Ari Gowder, H. B. ..	The Nilgiris, N.-M. Rural.
8. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur R. N.	Central Districts, Indian Christian.
9. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.	Central Districts, Muhammadan Rural.
10. Basu Dev, C.	NOMINATED.
11. Bayappa Reddi, P.	Anantapur, N.-M. Rural.
12. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur, S. M. K.	Ceded Districts, Muhammadan Rural.
13. Bhanoji Rao, A. V.	NOMINATED.
14. Birley, Frank	Madras Chamber of Commerce.
15. Campbell, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., C.B.E., V.D., I.C.S., The hon. Sir Archibald.	EX OFFICIO.
16. Davis, O.B.E., J. A.	Anglo-Indian.
17. Devadasan, M.	NOMINATED.
18. Dharmalingam Pillai, Rao Sahib V.	NOMINATED.
19. Duraiswami Reddiyar, K. M.	South Arcot, N.-M. Rural.
20. Ellappa Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur S.	Salem, N.-M. Rural.
21. Foulkes, R.	NOMINATED.
22. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur M.	Bellary, N.-M. Rural.
23. Harischandrudu Nayudu, A. ..	Godavari East, N.-M. Rural.
24. Hood, I.C.S., H. M.	NOMINATED.
25. Hutton, A. W.	European.
26. Indriah, C.	Godavari West, N.-M. Rural.
27. Jagannadha Raju, Rao Bahadur G. (*Deputy President*).	Vizagapatam, N.-M. Rural.
28. Jagannatham, H. M.	NOMINATED.
29. James, F. E.	Madras Planters.

Name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
30. Jayaram Nayudu, Rao Sahib C.	Chingleput, N.-M. Rural.
31. C. E. Jones, I.C.S.	NOMINATED.
32. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu, K.	Cocanada City, N.-M. Urban.
33. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur P.	Madura and Trichinopoly *cum* Srirangam, Muhammadan Urban.
34. Kolanda Reddi, Rai Sahib C.	Kistna, N.-M. Rural.
35. Koti Reddi, K.	Cuddapah, N.-M. Rural.
36. Krishnamurti, Rao Sahib D. ..	NOMINATED.
37. Krishnan, C.	NOMINATED.
38. Krishnan Nayar, *Kt.*, The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M.	EX OFFICIO.
39. Krishnaswami Ayyar, *Kt.*, Diwan Bahadur Sir Alladi.	NOMINATED.
40. Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri (Raja Velugoti Sarvagnya Kumara Krishnayachendrula Bahadur Varu).	Nellore, N.-M. Rural.
41. Kumaraswami Reddiyar, The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. (*Minister*).	Tinnevelly, N.-M. Rural.
42. Kuppuswami Choudari, J. ..	Guntur, N.-M. Rural.
43. Lakshmana Reddi, G. ..	Anantapur, N.M.-Rural.
44. Luker, F. G.	Madras Trades Association.
45. Madanagopal Nayudu, R. ..	Madras City, N.-M. Urban.
46. Madhusoodhanan Thangal, P.	NOMINATED.
47. Maharaja of Venkatagiri (Sri Raja Velugoti Sir Govinda Krishna Yachendrula Bahadur Varu, K.C.I.E., Lieutenant-Colonel).	North Central Landholders.
48. Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.	Northern Circars, Muhammadan Rural.
49. Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.	South Kanara, Muhammadan Rural.
50. Manikkavelu Nayakar, M. A.	North Arcot, N.-M. Rural.
51. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur T. M.	Malabar, Muhammadan Rural.
52. Moses, P. C.	Northern Districts, Christian.
53. Muhammad Meera Ravuttar Bahadur, K. P. V. S. ..	Madura *cum* Trichinopoly, Muhammadan Rural.
54. Muniswami Nayudu, the hon. Diwan Bahadur B. (*Minister*).	Chittoor, N.-M. Rural.
55. Muniswami Pillai, Rao Sahib V. I.	NOMINATED.
56. Murugappa Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur A. M. M.	Ramnad, N.-M. Rural.
57. Muthiah Chettiyar, M. A. ..	Southern India Chamber of Commerce.

Name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
58. Muthu Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur P. C.	Madura, N.-M. Rural.
59. Nachiyappa Gounder, K. A. ..	Salem, N.-M. Rural.
60. Nadimuthu Pillai, A. Pl. N. V.	Tanjore N.-M. Rural.
61. Nanjappa Bahadur, Subadar-Major S. A.	NOMINATED.
62. Narasa Reddi, T.	Cuddapah, N.-M. Rural.
63. Narasimhaswami, D. V. ..	Godavari East, N.-M. Rural.
64. Narayanan Nambiyar, V. P.	Malabar, N.-M. Rural.
65. Narayanaswami Pillai, Rao Bahadur T. M.	Trichinopoly, N.-M. Rural.
66. Natesa Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur C.	Madras City, N.-M. Urban.
67. Palat, R. M.	West Coast Landholders.
68. Pannirselvam, Rao Bahadur A. T.	Tanjore and Trichinopoly *cum* Madura, Christian.
69. Parthasarathi Ayyangar, C. R.	Chittoor, N.-M. Rural.
70. Patnaik Mahasayo, Sriman M. G.	Ganjam, N.-M. Rural.
71. Patro, *Kt.*, Rao Bahadur Sir A. P.	Ganjam, N.-M. Rural.
72. Pattabhiramayya, K.	Kistna, N.-M. Rural.
73. Pattagar of Palayakottai (Rai Bahadur Nallathambi Sarkarai Manradiyar).	Coimbatore, N.-M. Rural.
74. Peddi Raju, P.	Godavari West, N.-M. Rural.
75. Pocker Sahib Bahadur, B. ..	Malabar, Muhammadan Rural.
76. Premayya, G. R.	NOMINATED.
77. Rajagopala Pillai, P. V. ..	NOMINATED.
78. Raja of Bobbili (Sri Ravu Swetachallapathi Ramakrishna Ranga Rao).	Vizagapatam, N.-M. Rural.
79. Raja of Kallikote (Raja Sri Ramachandra Marda Raja Deo Garu).	Northern Landholders, I.
80. Raja of Parlakimedi (Sri Sri Sri Krishna Chandra Gajapathi Narayana Deo Garu).	Ganjam, N.-M. Rural.
81. Rajan, The hon. Mr. P. T. (*Minister*).	Madura, N.-M. Rural.
82. Ramachandra Padayachi, P. K.	South Arcot, N.-M. Rural.
83. Ramachandra Reddi, The hon. Mr. B. (*President*).	Nellore, N.-M. Rural.
84. Ramakrishna Reddi, A. ..	Kurnool, N.-M. Rural.
85. Ramalingam Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur T. A.	Coimbatore, N.-M. Rural.
86. Ramamurti, Pandit Ganala ..	NOMINATED.
87. Raman Menon, K. P.	Malabar, N.-M. Rural.
88. Ramaswami Ayyar, T. S. ..	Madras University.
89. Ramaswami Mudaliyar, V. M.	North Arcot, N.-M. Rural.
90. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, A. ..	Bellary, N.-M. Rural.

Name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
91. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, G. ..	Tanjore, N.-M. Rural.
92. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, M. D. T.	Tinnevelly *cum* Palamcottah, N.-M. Urban.
93. Rangaswami Reddi, M. B. ..	North Arcot, N.-M. Rural.
94. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur C. S.	Coimbatore, N.-M. Rural.
95. Sahajananda, Swami A. S. ..	NOMINATED.
96. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti ..	Madras City, N.-M. Urban.
97. Satyanarayana Choudari, C. ..	Guntur, N.-M. Rural.
98. Sesha Reddi, B. P.	Kurnool, N.-M. Rural.
99. Shetty, A. B.	South Kanara, N.-M. Rural.
100. Simhachalam Pantulu, Gade ..	Guntur, N.-M. Rural.
101. Singam Ayyangar, K. ..	Trichinopoly *cum* Srirangam, N.-M. Urban.
102. Siva Raj, Rao Sahib N. ..	NOMINATED.
103. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar, K. S.	Tanjore, N.-M. Rural.
104. Slater, C.M.G., C.I.E., I.C.S., S.H.	NOMINATED.
105. Smitb, C.I.E., I.C.S., E. Conran.	NOMINATED.
106. Soundara Pandian, W. P. A.	NOMINATED.
107. Sreshta, M. S.	West Coast, Christian.
108. Srinivasa Ayyangar, T. C. ..	Ramnad, N.-M. Rural.
109. Srinivasan, Rao Bahadur R. ..	NOMINATED.
110. Sriramulu, G.	NOMINATED.
111. Stanes, F. G.	Madras Cbamber of Commerce.
112. Stokes, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. H. G.	EX-OFFICIO.
113. Subbarayan, Dr. P. ..	South Central Landholders.
114. Subrahmanyam Chetti, Rao Sahib P.	NOMINATED.
115. Subrahmanya Bhatt, U. C. ..	Kanara South, N.-M. Rural.
116. Sundara Rao Nayudu, T. ..	Madras City, N.-M. Urban.
117. Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur, Khan Sahib.	Tanjore, Muhammadan.
118. Thomas, Daniel	Ramnad *cum* Tinnevelly, Christian.
119. Thorne, C.I.E., I.C.S., J. A. ..	NOMINATED.
120. Usman Sahib Bahadur, *Kt.*, The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed.	EX-OFFICIO.
121. Vasudeva Pillai, V. G. ..	NOMINATED.
122. Vedachala Mudaliyar, M. ..	Chingleput, N.-M. Rural.
123. Venkatarama Ayyar, K. R. ..	Madura City, N.-M. Urban.
124. Venugopal Nayudu, Rao Bahadur R. K.	South Arcot, N.-M. Rural.
125. Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.	East Coast, Muhammadan Rural.
126. Yakub Hasan Sahib Bahadur.	North Arcot *cum* Chingleput.
127. Zamindar of Bodinayakkanur (Kamaraja Pandia Nayakar, T.V.K.).	Southern Landholders.

Name of member.	*Name and class of constituency.*
128. Zamindar of Chemudu (Sri Vyricherla Narayana Gajapati Raju).	Vizagapatam City, N.-M. Urban.
129. Zamindar of Ettayapuram (Raja Jaga Veera Rama Kumara Venkateswara Ettappa Nayakar Ayyan).	Tinnevelly, N.-M. Rural.
130. Zamindar of Kirlampudi (Sri Raja Ravu Ramakrishna Ranga Rao).	NOMINATED.
131. Zamindar of Minampalli (K. C. M. Venkatachala Reddiyar).	Trichinopoly, N.-M. Rural.
132. Zamindar of Mirzapuram (Mirzapuram Raja alias Venkataramayya Appa Rao).	Northern Landholders, II.

SPECIAL MEMBERS.

133. Appu Nayar, P.	NOMINATED for the consideration of the Nambudri Bill and the Marumakkattayam Bills.
134. Newcomb, Lieut.-Col. Clive ..	NOMINATED for the consideration of the Bill to amend the Madras Medical Registration Act, 1914.

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

OFFICIAL REPORT.

Third Session of the Fourth Legislative Council under the Government of India Act, 1919.

Tuesday, the 2nd August 1932.

The House met at eleven of the clock, Mr. President (the hon. Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI) in the Chair.

PRESENT:

Usman Sahib Bahadur, *Kt.*, The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed.
Krishnan Nayar, *Kt.*, The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M.
Archibald Campbell, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., O.B.E., V.D., I.C.S., The hon. Sir.
Stokes, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. H. G.
Muniswami Nayudu, The hon. Diwan Bahadur B.
Rajan, The hon. Mr. P. T.
Kumaraswami Reddiyar, The hon. Diwan Bahadur S.
Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.
Ahmed Meeran Sahib Bahadur.
Alamelumangathayaramma, Mrs. K.
Arasu, Mr. V. T.
Ari Gowder, Mr. H. B.
Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur R. N.
Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
Basu Dev, Mr. C.
Bayappa Reddi, Mr. P.
Beyabani Sahib Bahadur, S. M. K.
Bhanoji Rao, Mr. A. V.
Birley, Mr. F.
Davis, M.B.E., Mr. J. A.
Dharmalingam Pillai, Rao Sahib V.
Ellappa Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur S.
Harischandrudu Nayudu, Mr. A.
Hood, I.C.S., Mr. H. M.
Hutton, Mr. A. W.
Indriah, Mr. C.
Jagannadha Raju, Rao Bahadur G.
Jagannatham, Mr. H. M.
James, Mr. F. E.
Jayaram Nayudu, Rao Sahib C.
Jones, I.C.S., Mr. C. E.
Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu, Mr. K.
Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
Kolanda Reddi, Rai Sahib C.
Koti Reddi, Mr. K.
Krishnamurti, Rao Sahib D.
Krishnan, Mr. C.
Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri, The
Kuppuswami Choudari, Mr. J.
Lakshmana Reddi, Mr. G.
Luker, Mr. F. G.
Madanagopal Nayudu, Mr. R.
Madhusoodhanan Thangal, Mr. P.
Maharaja of Venkatagiri, The
Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.
Manikkavelu Nayakar, Mr. M. A.
Moidoo Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur T. M.
Moses, Mr. P. C.
Muniswami Pillai, Rao Sahib V. I.
Muthiah Chettiyar, Mr. M. A.
Muthu Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur P. C.
Nachiyappa Gounder, Mr. K. A.
Nadimuthu Pillai, Mr. A. Pl. N. V.
Nanjappa Bahadur, Subadar-Major S. A.
Narasa Reddi, Mr. T.
Narasimhaswami, Mr. D. V.
Narayanaswami Pillai, Rao Bahadur T. M.
Natesa Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur C.
Palat, Mr. R. M.
Pannirselvam, Rao Bahadur A. T.
Parthasarathi Ayyangar, Mr. C. R.
Patnaik Mahasayo, Sriman M. G.
Patro, *Kt.*, Rao Bahadur Sir A. P.
Pattagar of Palayakottai, The
Peddi Raju, Mr. P.

PRESENT:—*cont.*

Pocker Sahib Bahadur, B.
Rajagopala Pillai, Mr. P. V.
Raja of Bobbili, The
Raja of Kallikote, The
Ramalingam Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur T. A.
Ramamurti, Pandit Ganala.
Raman Menon, Mr. K. P.
Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. T. S.
Ramaswami Mudaliyar, Mr. V. M.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. A.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. M. D. T.
Rangaswami Reddi, Mr. M. B.
Ratnasabbapati Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur C. S.
Sahajanandam, Swami A. S.
Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, Mr.
Satyanarayana Choudari, Mr. C.
Sesha Reddi, Mr. B. P.
Shetty, Mr. A. B.
Simhachalam, Mr. G.
Singam Ayyangar, Mr. K.
Siva Raj, Rao Sahib N.
Slater, C.M.G., C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. S. H.
Smith, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. E. C.
Sreshta, Mr. M. S.
Srinivasan, Rao Bahadur R.
Sriramulu, Mr. G.
Stanes, Mr. F. J.
Subbarayan, Dr. P.
Subrahmanya Chetti, Rao Sahib P.
Subrahmanya Bhatt, Mr. U. C.
Sundara Rao Nayudu, Mr. T.
Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur, Khan Sahib.
Thomas, Mr. Daniel.
Thorne, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. J. A.
Vedachala Mudaliyar, Mr. M.
Venkatachala Reddiyar, Mr. K. C. M. (Zamindar of Minampalli).
Venugopal Nayudu, Rao Bahadur R. K.
Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
Zamindar of Chemudu, The
Zamindar of Kirlampudi, The
Zamindar of Mirzapuram, The

I.—SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The following Members made the prescribed oath or affirmation of allegiance to the Crown and took their seats:

Mr. F. J. STANES.

Mr. C. E. JONES, I.C.S.

M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur A. T. PANNIRSELVAM Avargal.

Mr. P. PEDDI RAJU.

II.—ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

His Excellency the GOVERNOR then addressed the Council as follows:—

"Mr. President and hon. Members of the Legislative Council,—Since the last meeting of the Council the three Committees which visited this country at the beginning of the year have issued their reports, but the only one to which I intend to refer at the moment is that of the Franchise Committee. I am glad to say that it accepted in the main with slight alterations the proposals put forward by this Government. Those proposals, though perhaps not going so far as some people may have wished, will greatly extend the franchise in this Presidency and the Franchise Committee described them as a well thought-out and balanced scheme. For this we are very greatly indebted to the Chairman and Members of the Provincial Franchise Committee, to whom I once again offer the best thanks of the Government for their careful consideration of the difficult problem which confronted them.

"We have also had the statement of the Secretary of State on the procedure which His Majesty's Government propose to adopt in order to expedite the passage into law of the Bill which will confer further reforms on this country and I regret very much that in one important

2nd August 1932]

particular this proposal has caused dissatisfaction. In this connexion I may give the reasons why I have disallowed a resolution which it was proposed to move in this Council to the effect that the procedure outlined by the Secretary of State is not acceptable to Indian opinion. I have done so because in my opinion it is not primarily the concern of this Government but of His Majesty's Government and of the Government of India, who have been clearly informed by responsible leaders that the new procedure is not acceptable to them. I naturally therefore do not intend to discuss it myself, but I must own that I have been greatly influenced in my decision by the opinion that I hold very strongly that, once it has been made clear—as it has been—that the proposal does not meet with favour, the less said the better at this particular juncture when all efforts are being directed, and I hope will be successfully directed, towards finding some way out of the present difficulty. I do not think, however, that I shall be transgressing if I say that I am quite sure we are all agreed in hoping that it will be possible to find a solution which will satisfy Indian opinion and which will at the same time secure the object aimed at by His Majesty's Government, viz., to expedite the passing of the Bill which will usher in a new era in this country. If I may be allowed to make a personal reference, I am particularly anxious that this should be so, as ever since I entered on my present office I have always cherished the hope that it might be my privilege to inaugurate the reforms here and see them working satisfactorily in this Presidency, where at any rate I am confident they will be operated for the good of the Presidency and of its inhabitants.

"The ordinances which have been in force since the beginning of this year were due to expire early last month, and we have considered it necessary to renew some of them. My Government and I would willingly and gladly have let them lapse if we had felt we could do so with safety. But, so long as a certain section of the people persist in carrying on the civil disobedience movement with all its senseless futility, we could not hold ourselves justified in not retaining the ordinances. It is not that they have been extensively used in this Presidency—the figures of convictions under them show they have not—and they are only aimed at those who are determined to create such a situation as would be the worst possible condition under which the new reforms would start. I must point out that, however far-reaching the new reforms may be, they would be seriously handicapped from their very inception if the idea were to get abroad that law and order need not be respected, and my Government and I are determined that we will not leave to the future responsible Government of this Presidency a legacy to the effect that a small minority of the people can with impunity defy the Government of the day, which defiance would, if successful, speedily lead to a condition of chaos and of anarchy.

"I regret to have to say that in parts of the Bellary district a difficult situation has arisen owing to the failure of the monsoon last year in that district. So far the rainfall has been promising this year and meantime steps are being taken to deal with the situation which will I trust be effective in preventing any very great measure of distress.

"The monsoon this year was late, but reports from the districts show that so far it has not been unfavourable; and, though one cannot yet take a very rosy view of the general economic situation, I believe prices have been steady and it is possible to take at any rate a less pessimistic, though still far from optimistic, view of the prospects than would have been possible some weeks ago. The general desire displayed at Lausanne to come to some agreement on the subject of war debts and reparations must have a good effect on the world's economic conditions, and I trust that India will receive a full share of any improvement that may take place.

"Hon. Members are doubtless aware that a committee met early this year to discuss the question of the advisability of the formation of a separate province of Orissa and whether in such a case certain portions of Madras should be transferred to the new province. That committee has now made certain recommendations, and an opportunity will be given to hon. Members to express their opinions on the reasonableness or otherwise of those recommendations. The Government trust that hon. Members will give them the benefit of their advice on this subject, which may have far-reaching consequences, so as to enable them, when making representations as they will have to do on this question, not only to give their own view of the advisability of the proposed transfer but also to give the considered opinion of the Madras Legislative Council.

"There is one question to which I desire to refer although it is for the moment, and will probably for some years to come, be merely of academic interest. But it seems to me to be a question that must ultimately arise and will then be of great importance, and I therefore mention it to you now for your consideration.

"There are, as you know, two principal methods by which a parliamentary majority may be formed—the Party system and the Group system. The former prevails in Great Britain and in America, and the latter is predominant in France and to a lesser extent in Germany. The main difference, as I see it, between the two systems is that in the Party system the leader—so long as he is the leader—has the right to expect unswerving loyalty and support from his party; in the Group system the leader has to satisfy the various groups that compose the party in order to enlist their support. It would appear then theoretically that the former system ensures a more stable government, and I believe I am correct in saying that it is so in actual practice. The question that I now put before you is whether the Party or the Group system will ultimately prevail in this Presidency. As the people of the Presidency get more political consciousness, will political questions cut across caste and creed, or, will caste and creed predominate over political questions? That is a question that I am of course utterly incompetent to answer, and I venture to think that you, Gentlemen, also would not care to prophesy what the future may bring forth in this connexion. But it is a question that is likely to be fraught with such far-reaching consequences for the Presidency when it does arise that I make no apology for bringing it to your notice now—academic though I have already said

2nd August 1932]

it may be at the moment. Whatever may be the result, I hope and believe that this Council will always bear in mind that the Members are not in the Council for their own advancement but are returned to serve the interests of those they represent. So long as that is the standard that Legislative Councillors put before themselves, I have no fear but that Madras will continue to show to the rest of India how provincial autonomy should and can be carried out."

III.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS

Law and Order—General

Alleged beating of three picketers under the orders of the Circle Inspector of Police, Mangalore.

* 1 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: With reference to question No. 1117, answered on 24th March 1932, regarding three picketers beaten by the Mangalore Police on 10th February 1932 for picketing Messrs. R. B. Vasant & Co., will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the further report called for as to why it was necessary to inflict so many blows has been received by the Government; if so, whether the hon. the Home Member will be pleased to place on the table a copy of the first as well as the further report;

(*b*) whether the crowd that assembled to watch the beating was an unlawful assembly and why it was ordered to disperse;

(*c*) after the crowd showed disposition to disperse as stated in the answer why the picketers were beaten and that so severely; and

(*d*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take against the officers that have used such excessive force?

A.—(*a*) The report has been received. Both this and the previous report are confidential; so it is not proposed to place them on the table of the House, but the required information is given below.

(*b*) The unlawful assembly consisted of the picketers and volunteers prepared to assist them who failed to disperse after being warned.

(*c*) A section of the crowd took up a defiant attitude even after being warned to disperse. They were therefore dispersed with light canes. Some members of the unlawful assembly sustained injuries, but none of the injuries was serious. The attitude of the section of the crowd which refused to disperse was such that considerable force had to be used.

(*d*) Instructions have already been issued that force should not be used in excess of the requirements of the situation. It is for the officer on the spot to decide what amount of force is necessary to effect dispersal. The need for discretion in the use of force has been impressed on all officers.

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"In answer to the question it is stated that the crowd that gathered became menacing, etc. May I ask, Sir, on what authority that statement is made. Generally when these picketers go out, there is usually a big crowd merely watching them. But does that become an unlawful assembly? I believe, Sir, in law there must be a common object for an unlawful assembly."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"The statement has been made on the authority of the District Magistrate who has reported to the Government after making due enquiry."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask what the nature of the enquiry made was?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"After enquiring the people who were there and the police officers, he has made the report to the Government."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"It is stated in answer to clause (b) that the unlawful assembly consisted of the picketers and volunteers prepared to assist them. May I know how before any overt act was committed by those who were present there the police came to know of their unlawful object?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"As I have said, that is from the report of the District Magistrate."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know whether the report says anything as to the preparations made to assist the volunteers?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Yes. That is a fact, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"In answer to clause (c), it is stated 'a section of the crowd took up a defiant attitude even after being warned to disperse.' May I know what it means?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"The Police asked them to disperse. But they would not. They abused the police and became turbulent and vociferous."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I say that I did not ask what the Police thought of the crowd?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"My hon. Friend wanted to know what the meaning of the statement was, and what I have said is from the report of the District Magistrate."

Alleged police excesses on picketers at Mangalore.

* 2 Q.—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: With reference to question No. 1118 answered on 24th March 1932, will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government received the information called for;
(b) what the information is; and

2nd August 1932]

(c) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The number of beatings was not recorded and it is not possible to furnish information at this distance of time. The nature of the wounds was contusions and stick marks. No picketer fell down unconscious as a result of the beating. The picketers were removed to the Hospital by the police.

(c) None.

Alleged beating of two volunteers by the Police in Mangalore on 26th March 1932.

* 3 Q.—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether two volunteers Babu Shetti and Subbayya Shetti picketed on 26th March 1932 the foreign yarn shop of Ganesh Srinivasa Pai in Mangalore and whether the Police formed a cordon round the volunteers and beat them with canes;

(b) under what provision of law the two volunteers within the police ring were beaten by the police; and

(c) whether it is a fact that two volunteers Subbayya Shetti and Vaikunta Shirianna picketed the shop of D. Kanji Bros. at Mangalore on the same date and were severely beaten by the police?

A.—(a) The two persons mentioned picketed a foreign yarn shop on 26th March 1932. The picketers and the crowd that had collected were warned by the Police to disperse. The two persons received some cuts from canes but no cordon was formed round them.

(b) The picketers were not beaten within a Police ring.

(c) The volunteers picketed the shop referred to and a crowd collected. They were warned to disperse and on refusal to disperse they received some cuts from canes.

Alleged beating of two volunteers for picketing the shop of D. Kanji Bros. on 6th April 1932.

* 4 Q.—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that only two volunteers picketed the foreign cloth shop of D. Kanji Bros. on 6th April 1932 at 4-30 p.m. in Mangalore town;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Police came in their van headed by the Circle Inspector and Sub-Inspector of Police and beat the picketers with canes;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Police van was placed between the picketers and the main portion of the road;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that between the van and the shop of D. Kanji Bros. there were no persons on the public road except the picketers and the Police men;

(*e*) whether it is a fact that the passers-by who stopped on the public road after the beating commenced were about 50 yards away from the picketers;

(*f*) whether it is a fact that they were given 10 or 12 severe beatings by the cane;

(*g*) whether they showed the least signs of violence or retaliation; and

(*h*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(*a*) Two picketers picketed the foreign cloth shop with six other volunteers and some on-lookers standing nearby.

(*b*) The Police warned the assembly to disperse, but the volunteers and picketers did not move. They were therefore dispersed with light canes.

(*c*) No. The van was kept near the Wenlock Hospital compound wall.

(*d*) The facts reported are otherwise.

(*e*) When the Police arrived and warned the crowd of on-lookers to disperse they moved on and stopped about 50 yards away, except the picketers and volunteers.

(*f*) One picketer had ten cuts and the other had fourteen. The beatings were not severe. The picketers were discharged immediately after they were sent to the hospital.

(*g*) They showed a determined disobedience to the orders of the Police to desist from committing the offence.

(*h*) None.

Alleged Police excesses in South Kanara.

* 5 *Q*.—MR. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: With reference to question No. 1237 answered on 24th March 1932, will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) what action has been taken with reference to the complaints against Police excesses at Kanhangod on 11th February 1932 and other places made by some of the leading vakils of Kasaragod;

(*b*) whether any enquiry was held into the same; if so, who were all the persons that were examined; and

(*c*) whether any of the complainants were examined or were given any opportunity to adduce evidence; if not, why not?

A.—(*a*) The letter from the vakils of Kasaragod, a copy of which was laid on the table of the House on 24th March 1932 with reference to clause (*a*) of question No. 1237 makes three main allegations and they are answered below:—

(1) At Kanhangod on 11th February 1932 a crowd numbering about 50 gathered to watch the picketing. The picketers and the crowd were

ordered to disperse and refusing to do so were dispersed by force. No person was beaten who was not a member of the crowd at the time it was dispersed and no person was singled out for attack. V. Chatukutti Nayar who was then the "dictator" of the Kasaragod Taluk Congress Association and Madhavan Nayar, a Congress volunteer, were among the picketers.

(2) At Pilicode on 11th February 1932 Naraina Adiodi was beaten during the course of a forcible dispersal but was not beaten into unconsciousness when at some distance from the crowd. He was a few yards away when the dispersal began but then advanced as though to encourage the picketers. He was warned to go away but defied the order and was therefore dispersed together with the rest. He subsequently feigned unconsciousness but was able to get up and go away after a very short interval. Harishwaran Tirumumbu was not singled out and chased away but was a member of the crowd that was dispersed. No person of the name of Madhavan Nayar was beaten at Pilicode but a person of that name was among the crowd dispersed by force at Kanhangod on the same day. He was not intentionally struck on the head.

(3) It is not the case that the injured were left unattended where they fell. While the Inspector was arranging to have those who had fallen removed to the hospital they got up one by one and walked away. Nobody was seriously injured, as canes and not lathis were used to disperse the crowds.

(*b*) & (*c*) If any person was prepared to substantiate a complaint, it was open to him to prefer a complaint in court. In the absence of any individual complaint, the District Magistrate did not examine any complainant, but satisfied himself that the allegations were incorrect or exaggerated.

Alleged beating of three persons at the Washermanpet police station lock-up on 3rd April 1932.

* 6 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have received a statement signed by Manicka Nayakar, M. Kulshekar Nayakar and V. Krishnaswami Nayakar stating that they were beaten by the Police in the Washermanpet Police station lock-up on 3rd April 1932;

(*b*) whether the Government held any enquiry on the same; if so, who the persons examined were and what the result is of the said enquiry; and

[2nd August 1932

(c) whether any opportunity was given to the complainants to be present at the time of the enquiry and give their own statement or adduce other evidence?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) No statement was received by the Government. The Government obtained a report on seeing the statement published in *Swarajya* and found the allegation about beating in the Police lock-up to be totally false. The persons mentioned with the crowd that collected were dispersed after warning, but they were not taken to the Washermanpet Police station or beaten there.

Alleged cruelty on the part of the Police at Robertsonpet, Masulipatam.

* 7 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether he has received a letter from Sjt. P. Ghanta Reddi complaining that himself and J. Pattabhi Ramayya were taken by the Police of Robertsonpet Police station, Masulipatam, on the 27th March 1932 to the said Police station and that the Police beat Pattabhi Ramayya and that Mr. Ghanta Reddi who was taken to the lock up, was kicked on the chest and back by the Police and also beaten, and that one head constable spat on his face; if so, whether he will be pleased to place a copy of the same on the table of the House;

(b) whether any enquiry was held on the same; if so, whether the said complainant was examined or any statement was taken from him or any opportunity was given to him to be present at the time of the enquiry and adduce evidence; and

(c) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(a) Yes. A copy[a] of the letter is placed on the table of the House.

(b) & (c) The District Magistrate has made such enquiry as he found necessary. It was open to the two persons mentioned to complain to the District Magistrate, if they were prepared to substantiate the facts alleged. If they have not done so, the Government do not propose to take any further action.

Alleged detention of three ladies in unlawful custody by the Ellore Police.

* 8 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that Srimathi Mudumbi Venkatamma, Javaj Rajaratnamma, Maddula Damayantamma, were arrested on the 18th March in Ellore for distributing Congress pamphlets and released on 2nd April 1932;

---

[a] Printed as Appendix I on page 103 infra.

2nd August 1932]

(*b*) under what provision of law the Police arrested them and kept them for such a length of time in the sub-jail without their being charge-sheeted and brought before the Sub-Magistrate for trial;

(*c*) in whose custody were the said ladies during their detention; and

(*d*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) On 18th March 1932 the three persons were found exhorting students in the Ellore High School compound to take part in Congress activity, and distributing Congress leaflets. They were arrested for having committed an offence under section 17 (1) of the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908, and remanded to custody pending investigation by the Police as to who had instigated them to commit the offence and as to the origin of the Congress leaflets. Investigation showed that these persons were of minor importance and were merely tools in the hands of others. It was therefore decided not to prosecute them. They were released on 2nd April 1932 within the period of 15 days remand permissible under section 167, Criminal Procedure Code, for purpose of Police investigation.

(*c*) They were under custody in the Sub-Jail, Ellore.

(*d*) None.

Search of the Khadi depot of the Andhra branch of the All-India Spinners Association at Nidadavole.

* 9 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Police searched the premises and the Khadi depot of the Andhra branch of the All-India Spinners Association at Nidadavole; and

(*b*) whether they seized any account books, and if so, what books, how many, and why; and whether they have been since returned; if not, why not?

A.—The Government have no information but have called for it.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know whether the information called for has not yet been received by the Government?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"No, Sir."

Alleged handcuffing of Congress volunteers under arrest.

* 10 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether two Congress volunteers Basappa and Mahabala Alva who were arrested by the Police of Mangalore in about March were

cited as witnesses in Mr. B. Venkappa Rai's case which was pending before the Subdivisional Magistrate, Mangalore; if so, whether they were brought to the Subdivisional Magistrate's Court and handcuffed; and

(*b*) whether it is a fact that on the very same date, i.e, 28th March some other prisoners undergoing trial in the Sessions Court of Mangalore for murder were brought to the Sessions Court from the same jail; if so, whether it is a fact that they were not handcuffed?

A.—(*a*) The facts are as follows:—

On 28th March 1932 two Police constables were escorting the prisoners, Mahabala Alva and M. Basappa, one convicted and the other an under-trial, from the sub-jail to the Court of the Subdivisional Magistrate, Mangalore. On the way some persons collected shouting 'jais' and attempted to garland M. Alva. On account of this demonstration and more particularly because the prisoners refused to move, the escort grew anxious and, lest they should escape, handcuffed them for a short distance. As they were approaching the Court the handcuffs were removed. The prisoners were not handcuffed when they were taken back to the sub-jail, as there was no demonstration.

(*b*) It is reported that the murder case prisoners were handcuffed when being taken from the sub-jail to the Sessions Court on the same day.

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"May I know if it is the crying of 'jais' by the people and attempting to garland Mr. Alva that resulted in the handcuffing of the prisoners?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"The Police thought that the crowd gathered there would help the prisoners to escape."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"Because a crowd gathered, what reason is there for the Police to think that the prisoners will escape?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"The crowd showed sympathy with the prisoners and naturally it was thought that they would assist the prisoners in getting out of the Police custody."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"Is it that, when a crowd gathers, the prisoners ought to be handcuffed?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"When it was found there was a chance of the prisoners escaping from custody, they were handcuffed."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"Is it reported that the prisoners attempted to escape?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"There was a chance of escaping."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I ask whether it is laid down in the rules anywhere that, if the prisoners refused to move, they should be handcuffed? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— " No laying down of any rule is necessary. It is commonsense to guard against prisoners escaping."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" When the prisoners refuse to move, is it commonsense that the prisoners should be handcuffed? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— " I have nothing to add to what I have already said."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" If the prisoners are unable to move, what is the use of handcuffing them? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— " There was a big crowd and it was necessary to secure the prisoners."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Is it because of the crowd they were handcuffed? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— " The prisoners had a chance of escaping from custody."

Date of the addendum to the extract from the Police Gazette *regarding the use of lathis.*

* 11 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: With reference to the answer to question No. 1254, answered on 24th March 1932, will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state the date on which the addition of the last paragraph beginning with " add the following at the end of the section, etc." restricting the scope of the main body of instructions to formidable mobs, was made in the *Police Gazette,* dated the 2nd August 1930?

A.—6th February 1932.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—" May I know whether it is not a fact that till the 6th of February 1932, when the amendment was made, the order of the Government to use minimum force was not given effect to and the order of the Inspector-General of Police, as contained in the *Police Gazette* to use maximum force and that on the face and neck and head was in continuance? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— " The order was there, but it was not put to any practical use."

Prisons and Prisoners

Proposed shifting of the office of the Inspector-General of Prisons to Madras.

* 12 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether there is any proposal before the Government to shift the office of the Inspector-General of Prisons to Madras; and

(*b*) if so, when the Government propose to give effect to the same ?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The proposal is still under consideration.

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—" May I know when the Government will finish their consideration of this proposal? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" I am sorry that it is not possible to give a definite answer to that question."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—" May I know whether Government has been able to find out any building in the City and, if so, which building has been found for this purpose? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" That is one of the difficulties which the Government now have."

Retrenchment in the Jail department.

* 13 Q.—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) what the full scope and effect of the retrenchment effected by the Government in the Jail department is;

(b) which are the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee that have been accepted and which have not been accepted; and

(c) what the reason is for not accepting the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee, if any?

A.—(a) The hon. Member is referred to tables A, B and C in Appendix III to the report of Madras Retrenchment Committee, 1931–32. The Alipuram Jail, Bellary, has since been closed.

(b) All the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee have been accepted.

(c) Does not arise.

Desirability of abolishing the post of the test auditor for the Jail department.

* 14 Q.—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any test auditor for the Jail department or any section thereof;

(b) if so, what his duties are, and what the pay drawn by him is;

(c) what the travelling allowance drawn by him is during each of the last five years;

(d) what the reason is for there being no independent audit of the accounts of the Jail Department by the General Audit and Accounts Department; and

(e) whether the Government or the Retrenchment Committee have examined the question of abolishing the Test Auditor, and if so, with what result?

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*), (*c*) & (*e*) Do not arise.

(*d*) There is regular audit of the accounts of the Jail Department conducted by the Accountant-General's Audit staff.

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—" May I know whether it is a fact that an officer of the Jail department goes out from jail to jail checking the accounts before the accounts are really submitted to the regular Audit department? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" Notice, Sir."

Food-rations supplied to 'B' class prisoners in Vellore jail.

* 15 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to any complaint from 'B' class prisoners in the Vellore Central Jail regarding the food-rations supplied to them?

A.—No.

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—" May I know if the hon. the Law Member has not received any complaint with regard to the rations supplied to B class prisoners? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" No, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—" May I ask whether these prisoners are being allowed butter-milk? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" Yes, it is not butter-milk but curds."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—" May I know whether one prisoner, Dr. Lakshmidevamma, complained about the food given? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" I am not aware of it."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" Was any petition submitted to the hon. the Law Member about it? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" I do not remember."

Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar:—" Will the Government make an enquiry in the matter? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" If my hon. Friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, says there is a petition, I shall enquire."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—" Will B class prisoners be allowed to get what are necessary in the interests of their health according to the advice of the medical officer, at least with their own money? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" No."

[2nd August 1932

Putting of a wire-knitted screen between prisoners in Vellore Jail and the interviewing persons.

* 16 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that in the Vellore Central Jail, political prisoners have recently refused to interview their relatives as a protest against the putting of a wire-knitted screen between them and the interviewing persons; and

(*b*) whether such screens have been put in the interview rooms in other jails also and, if so, since when and for what reasons?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have no information.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"May I know why the Government did not get the information?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Because it was thought unnecessary."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Have they still not got the information?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"If my hon. Friend wants it, I shall get the information."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether wire-knitted screens are put in between prisoners and those interviewing them?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"It is about this that I have said that the Government have no information."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"The question is whether the prisoners refuse to interview because of the wire-knitted screen, and the Government reply is that they have no information. I want to know whether the practice of wire-knitted screen is being put up when convicts seek interviews?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"The Government have no information on that point either."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know if the purdah system which is dying out is being introduced in the jails?"

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I know if Government instructed the Superintendents of Jails to guard these interviews?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"There are standing rules relating to interviews."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Has there been any occasion to ask the Superintendents to observe them more strictly?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Notice, Sir."

Employment of machinery for Jail industries.

* 17 *Q.*—Mr. F. J. Stanes: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) the value of the outturn of jail industries in this province per year;

(*b*) the method adopted in fixing the selling price of jail produce; (Is it, for example, fixed after consultation with the Director of Industries?);

(*c*) what allowances are made in the costing of jail produce for—

(1) daily payment of labour,
(2) overhead charges;

(*d*) what is the policy of Government with regard to the introduction of machinery in jails in view of universal overproduction and the fact that the introduction of machinery in jails leads to definite increase of unemployment; and

(*e*) what percentage of jail labour trained in industrial occupations follows those occupations on discharge in civil life?

A.—(*a*) The value of articles manufactured in all the jails of the Presidency during 1931 was Rs. 10,36,911—vide Statement XII-B (Financial) appended to the Jail Administration Report.

(*b*) & (*c*) The prices of jail-made articles are fixed in accordance with rules 987, 988 and 988-A of the Jail Manual. Only in regard to dispute in the matter of prices between the Jail department and the consuming departments of Government the opinion of an expert officer of the Industries department is obtained.

(*d*) The policy adopted by Government is that laid down by the Indian Jails Committee, viz., "Familiarity with power-driven machinery is instructive and mind awakening and provision of such machinery subserves the true functions of the jail administration while at the same time it increases production and tends to give increased relief to the tax-payer and it is therefore from all these points of view justifiable, but it should be employed in well established and organized industries and care should be taken to avoid any interference with nascent or unorganized industrial enterprises." This policy has been reiterated by the Government of India, the Madras Retrenchment Committee and the Jail Industries Committee.

(*e*) The Government have no information.

Mr. F. J. Stanes:—"With reference to the answer to clause (*e*), will the Government consider the possibility of making enquiries from non-official agencies, as it one of the matters of policy laid down in the Indian Jails Committee Report?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I am afraid that the labour involved in the preparation of statistics and making enquiries will be out of all proportion to the benefits that are likely to be derived from the enquiries."

Mr. F. E. JAMES:—"Is the hon. Member aware that in Bengal, in the Punjab and in Bombay this very thing which my hon. Friend, Mr. Stanes, suggested is being carried out most extensively?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I am not aware."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"With reference to the answer to clauses (b) and (c), may I know whether disputes have not arisen in the matter of prices between the Police department and the Jail department?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"No dispute has arisen with reference to prices."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether any matter of dispute has arisen with regard to quality?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Yes, with reference to quality only."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether the price is not consistent with the quality and thus whether the dispute does not relate indirectly to price?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"It may be. But the dispute is not regarding price."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"What orders have Government passed on the matter?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"The Government held a conference in which the Inspector-General of Police and the Inspector-General of Prisons took part, and certain conventions were reached."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask what the nature of the complaint of the Police department is?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"That the quality is not of the required standard."

Shipping and Navigation

Amount of quay dues earned by the Madras Port Trust.

* 18 *Q.*—B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether during the year 1931–32 the Landing Agents of the Madras Port were remunerated at the rate of Rs. 2 per ton for cargo landed by boats and Re. 1 per ton for cargo landed directly on the quay;

(b) whether in previous years the rates were the same for both kinds of cargo;

(c) whether during 1931–32 the percentage of directly landed cargo has decreased, and if so, why;

(d) how many steamers can be accommodated in quay berths simultaneously;

(e) whether any steamer is over-kept in moorings and cargo landed from there, in spite of the fact that a quay berth is available for it;

(f) whether it is a fact that even from steamers at the quays, cargo is allowed to be landed into boats so that the Landing Agents would be enabled to earn Rs. 2 per ton instead of Re. 1; and

(g) what is the average rate of quay due per ton earned by the Madras Port Trust on cargo landed in the port during the year 1931–32?

A.—As the hon. Member is aware the Local Government are merely the Agents of the Government of India in regard to this matter.

It is presumed that the question relates only to cargo to which the consolidated landing charge is applicable.

(a) & (b) Yes.

(c) & (f) There has been a slight decrease in 1931–32 in the cargo landed direct on to the quay as compared with 1930–31, but an increase when compared with 1929–30 and a large increase over 1928–29. The landing of cargo is a matter under the control of the steamer agents. Cargo is frequently landed on to the quay on one side and into the boat on the other so as to expedite discharge.

(d) Four general cargo steamers and three coal steamers.

(e) This may happen as the occupation of quay berths is mainly controlled by shed accommodation.

(g) Approximately 4 annas 10 pies.

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" May I ask whether the Local Government have addressed the Government of India regarding the administration of the Port Trust in this matter of quay dues? If so, with what result? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" The Local Government are not their own masters in this matter except with reference to certain minor and unimportant details."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—" May I know what part the Local Government plays in fixing the quay dues? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" Ordinarily they accept the recommendations of the Port Trust Board in such matters."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—" May I know whether the attention of the hon. the Law Member has been drawn to the fact that there is a great agitation to decrease the quay dues? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" My attention has not been called to it."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" May I know whether it is the function of the Local Government as the Agents of the Government of India to consider policies enunciated by the Harbour Port Trust regarding the labour employed by it? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The Local Government is only the Agent of the Government of India and does not consider questions of policy."

Irrigation

Settlement of the dispute regarding the anicut at Ramasagar.

* 19 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to make a statement as to how the dispute between the ryots of the Madras and His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Governments with reference to the anicut at Ramasagar, Hospet taluk, Bellary district, has been settled, and if it has not yet been settled, the progress made in the negotiations towards settlement?

A.—It was agreed between His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Government and this Government that an Irrigation Engineer of each Government should meet at the site, discuss the question and submit a joint report with a view to an amicable settlement of the dispute. The joint report is awaited.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Have the Madras Government appointed their representatives? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" Yes."

The Kothapalli tank.

* 20 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state with reference to G.O. Ms. No. 679 I., dated 7th March 1928—

(*a*) the progress, if any, made in the carrying out of the scheme for improving the Kothapalli tank, Rayadrug taluk, Bellary district; and

(*b*) if the work has not yet been taken up, why and when it is likely to be taken up?

A.—(*a*) No progress has been made.

(*b*) The scheme is one of those which depend on the Hagari; the consideration of all schemes on the Hagari has been postponed till a decision is arrived at about the Tungabhadra project.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" May I know at what stage the consideration of Tungabhadra Project is now? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" As I have on previous occasion informed the Council the Tungabhadra Project is the subject of negotiation with the Hyderabad Government as well as with the Bombay Government and the Mysore Government."

2nd August 1932]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Have the Nizam's Government asked the Madras Government for any papers regarding the project?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"They have asked for information from time to time and it has been supplied as far as possible."

Chintalapalli Project.

*21 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state the reasons for the delay in the execution of Chintalapalli Project, Hadagalli taluk, Bellary district, and when the project is likely to be taken up for execution?

A.—The Chief Engineer has recently submitted a preliminary report and an approximate estimate for a scheme costing about Rs. 2·65 lakhs and has asked for special staff for a more detailed investigation of the scheme. The question is under the consideration of Government. It is not possible to say now when the scheme is likely to be taken up for execution.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask roughly what return the project is expected to give according to the preliminary report?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"I am sorry I cannot say off-hand."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Are the Government likely to sanction the staff required for investigation?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"The examination in the Secretariat is nearly completed; I hope that orders will be passed in a few days."

Construction of a culvert to the supply channel from the Hagari river to the Kanekal tank.

*22 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the supply channel from the Hagari river to the Kanekal tank, Rayadrug taluk, Bellary district, cuts the cart-track which is the chief means of communication to many villages and for carts attending the weekly shandies of Kanekal near Adiganihalli, and renders the crossing of the channel near the said village, very difficult and dangerous; and

(*b*) whether it is proposed now or in the near future to bridge the channel at the site referred to above by a small culvert?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have not the information but have called for a report.

Construction of a culvert in the cart-track leading from Veparalla to Kanekal.

* 23 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the cart-track leading from Veparalla and other villages to Kanekal and certain other villages, crosses the supply channel leading to Kanekal tank near Veparalla and whether the use of this cart-track during rainy season at the spot where it crosses the channel is difficult and dangerous; and

(*b*) whether it is proposed by the Government, now or in the near future, to construct a small culvert at the spot in question?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have not the information but have called for a report.

Land Revenue Administration

Preference to Probationary Revenue Inspectors for appointment as Deputy Tahsildars.

* 24 *Q.*—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Will the hon. the Member or Revenue be pleased to state whether in making appointments to the osts of Deputy Tahsildars, persons who have been directly recruited s Probationary Revenue Inspectors are given preference; and, if not, why they are not given such preference?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is drawn to the answer to clause (*b*) of question No. 1079 asked at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 22nd March 1932.

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—" May I know whether Government will issue instructions that persons who had been recruited as probationary revenue inspectors are to be given preference when appointments to the deputy tahsildars' posts take place? "

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—" No."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—" May I know whether there are any particular reasons prevailing with the Government for not issuing such instructions? "

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—" There are no reasons for issuing such instructions."

Relief to people in areas affected by cyclone in Malabar.

* 25 *Q.*—Mr. R. M. Palat: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government are aware that the cyclone which passed over Malabar towards the end of last May has inflicted great loss on certain parts of the district; and

2nd August 1932]

(*b*) what measures the Government have taken or propose to take to give relief to the people in the affected areas?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) Copies [a] of the reports from the Collector of Malabar, dated 27th May 1932 and 15th July 1932, are annexed.

Famine relief in Bellary district.

* 26 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of works in progress in the Bellary district at the time the Government ordered that the provisions of the Famine Code should apply to the carrying out of works of the cultivators and others in the district;

(*b*) the nature and kind of work and the place at which each was in progress;

(*c*) the average number of men, women and children employed during each of the four weeks prior to the stoppage of the work;

(*d*) the works since started according to the provisions of the Famine Code with particulars as to the nature of work, place and the number of men, women and children employed in each week in the month following the starting of the work; and

(*e*) the average wage paid to each man, woman and child before and after the change introduced by the Government?

A.—(*a*) Twenty.

(*b*) A statement [b] giving the information is attached.

(*c*) The average figures cannot be worked out without a good deal of labour. The actual number of workers reported on certain dates is as follows:—

Date.	Men.	Women.	Children.	Total.
27th April 1932 ..	5,948	9,562	3,527	19,037
4th May 1932 ..	5,514	8,617	2,993	17,124
12th May 1932 ..	1,833	3,021	899	5,753 †
19th May 1932 ..	2,972	4,745	1,528	9,245 †

† Figures incomplete.

(*d*) A statement giving particulars of the works is attached. The average daily attendance in each week was as follows:—

Week ending	Men.	Women.	Children.	Total.
10th June 1932 ..	..	..	..	4,015 ‡
17th June 1932 ..	..	..	..	7,744 ‡
25th June 1932 ..	3,186	5,770	1,700	10,656
2nd July 1932 ..	3,308	6,503	2,123	11,934
9th July 1932 ..	3,758	7,233	2,421	13,412

‡ Details not available.

[a] Printed as Appendix II on pages 103—106 infra.

[b] Printed as Appendix III on page 106 infra.

[2nd August 1932

(e) The rates of wages paid daily before the introduction of test works were:—

	RS.	A.	P.
For each man	0	3	0
For each woman	0	2	3
For each child	0	1	6
		or	
	0	1	0

The rates of wages payable on test works are given in the Famine Code. The rates are as follows for certain prescribed outturns. The actual amounts earned by the individual worker will depend on his or her outturn.

Workers.	Rate as increased under section *130 (a) (ii) of* the Famine Code.		
	RS.	A.	P.
Special class (i.e., gangmen or special gangs) ..	0	1	11
Class I (adults employed on digging, etc.) ..	0	1	7
Class II (adults employed on carrying, etc.) ..	0	1	3
Class III (children)	0	0	11

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask what the wages paid are after the departmental works were closed?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"The hon. Member has given me an opportunity of making a personal explanation. The rate paid to a worker in class I is 2 as. 1 p. if he does his full task. The figures in the answer have been based on calculations made in the Secretariat. The rates may vary from time to time with the price of grain."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I understand that 2 as. 1 p. just mentioned by the hon. Revenue Member is exclusive of the extra percentage allowed with reference to the prices of condiments?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"Yes."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask of the hon. Member to obtain the actual rates of wages paid?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"I have telegraphed for them and will place the figures on the table of the House when received."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Have these people been earning this all along or is it only recently this rate was introduced?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"I am under the impression that it has been the rate for a long time."

2nd August 1932]

Damage by cyclone in Kasaragod taluk.

* 27 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that owing to the unprecedented gale and rain vast tracts of cultivated land have been washed off or filled with mud and stones due to heavy land slides in the villages of Belur, Pullur and others in Kasaragod taluk;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that pattadars of the villages affected have made representations to the District Magistrate and the Board of Revenue praying that relief may be given to them in the matter of remissions of assessment; and

(*c*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) The Government have no information but have called for a report.

Procedure for the inspection of the records of the Village Panchayats by Revenue Officials.

* 28 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the records of the village panchayats should be inspected by Revenue officials in the panchayat village and at the Panchayat office; and

(*b*) if so, the action taken by the Government in the case of the officials, if any, who summoned the panchayat presidents to come to their office or camps though they might be at varying distances from the panchayat villages, with their records for inspection?

A.—Not necessarily. The records should be inspected as near the village concerned, as the revenue officer's convenience permits.

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—" May I ask whether the Government will be pleased to revise their orders to the effect that the Revenue officials should go to the panchayat offices for the purpose of inspecting their records instead of summoning them to their camps with all the records? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I shall consider the hon. Member's suggestion."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" Is the panchayat president an honorary or paid officer? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" He is an honorary officer."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" Does he get conveyance allowance for carrying the records? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I must ask the hon. Member to address the question to the Minister in charge of Local Self-Government."

Construction of a Thangal in S. No. 153/1 of Melchangam village.

* 29 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. RANGASWAMI REDDI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the terms of the order on which the construction of a Thangal in S. No. 153/1 of Melchangam village in Chengam taluk was permitted by the authorities in 1909; and

(*b*) whether the terms of the order have been adhered to in recent years and if not, why not?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have no information. A report has been called for.

Local Self-Government

Rural Reconstruction Supervisors.

* 30 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state the names of the local bodies that have so far appointed Rural Reconstruction Supervisors for village improvement work and the amount of subsidy, if any, sanctioned by the Government to assist such local bodies or other private agencies doing similar work?

A.—No information is available as to the names of the local bodies that have appointed Rural Reconstruction Supervisors. Apart from the grants sanctioned for the improvement of rural water-supply and village communications no grants are sanctioned specifically for the village improvement work.

Measures for the reduction of infant mortality in the Nandyal Municipality.

* 31 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state the measures taken by the Government to reduce the rate of infant mortality which, in 1928–29, rose from 123 to 198 per thousand births in the Nandyal Municipality?

A.—It is the duty of a Municipal Council to take steps to reduce the high rate of infant mortality in its area. When in 1928–29 the Government noted the increase of the rate of infant mortality in the Nandyal Municipality, they requested the Council to take prompt steps to bring it down. The figures for the subsequent years show that infant mortality has been steadily decreasing and that the Council has adopted measures calculated to bring down the high rate.

Measures for the relief of congestion in Nandyal Municipality.

* 32 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government granted any land for the relief of congestion and extension of the town of the Nandyal Municipality, and if so, when; and

(b) whether the municipality divided the land into numerous house-sites and sold them to prospective builders of houses, and if so, the number of sites sold during each of the years since the grant of the plot, the amounts for which they were sold, and the sums actually collected during each year up to date?

A.—A report [a] on the subject received from the Chairman, Municipal Council, Nandyal, is placed on the table.

Action taken on the memorandum from the Indian Roads and Transport Development Association, etc.

* 33 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether a copy of the memorandum presented to him by the Indian Roads and Transport Development Association and several other associations on 21st March 1932 will be placed on the table of the House; and

(b) whether the matter has been considered by the Government and any steps taken to help 'bus trade in this Presidency'?

A.—(a) A copy [b] is placed on the table.
(b) The matter is under consideration.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" May I know when the Government expect to arrive at a decision in regard to this matter?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" As the House knows a Committee was appointed to consider the question of bus licence fees and that Committee has appointed a Sub-Committee to go into the question. We are awaiting its report."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Has the Advisory Committee of the Local Self-Government made any recommendation in this matter?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" They are awaiting the report of that Sub-Committee."

Medical Administration

Appointment of L.I.M.'s to dispensaries under the local bodies.

* 34. Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) the steps the Government have taken to ensure the appointment of qualified L.I.M.'s to dispensaries under the control of local bodies in preference to unqualified practitioners; and

(b) whether any, and if so, how many local bodies have contravened such instructions, if any, issued by the Government and the action taken by them to enforce compliance with those instructions?

---

[a] Printed as Appendix III-A on page 107 infra.

[b] Printed as Appendix IV on pages 108—114 infra.

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) *Government have permitted local boards to appoint,* wherever they choose to do so, Licentiates in Indian Medicine of the Government Indian Medical School, Madras, *to be in charge of rural dispensaries* subsidised by Government. No orders have however been passed by Government compelling local bodies to appoint L.I.M.'s *in dispensaries,* the expenditure of which is wholly met by them. No local body has contravened the instruction regarding the appointment of L.I.M.'s to sub*sidised rural dispensaries. The question of registering* practitioners of Indian Medicine and prohibiting the appointment of practitioners, who are not registered, as *medical officers in any institution of Indian Medicine* maintained or aided by the State or local bodies or both is under the consideration of Government.

Religious and Charitable Endowments

Districts without temple committee.

* 35 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state the districts which at present have no temple committees working in them and the periods they have been without such committees respectively?

A.—A statement [a] is appended showing the districts in which temple committees are not functioning at present and the dates on which the terms of the committees which were functioning previously expired. No temple committee has been constituted for the Malabar district until now.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Practically the whole Presidency is without any temple committees. How is the work being carried on?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I am afraid I am not responsible for that. The hon. Member is aware that, when he was Minister, these committees went on functioning through nomination. Subsequently I had to consult the Advocate-General, in view of a doubt thrown upon that by the High Court of Madras and the Advocate-General gave his opinion that we *could not constitute a committee filling it by nomination.* Under another Act passed by this House, the Board has power to look after committee temples also. Proposals to constitute committees *otherwise than by a direct electorate* are now under consideration."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"How long has the hon. Minister been in charge?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I may state *the proceeding that was started by the previous Minister* was continued by me, and the Advocate-General advised me that we had no power in that matter."

---

[a] Printed as Appendix V on pages 114–115 infra.

2nd August 1932]

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I know the nature of the proposals under the consideration of Government with regard to the appointment of the Central Committee? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" They are considering the possibility of having district committees elected otherwise than by direct election, if possible through the local bodies."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Was that not the case in the North Arcot district? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" My idea then was to have a nominated council, the members to be nominated by the various local bodies; but the Government were advised that they have no power even for that."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Is it suggested to the hon. Minister to make these local bodies as constituencies for the election to the temple committees? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" That is one of the proposals under consideration."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" May I know what the qualifications are of these local bodies that may entitle them to become members of the local committees? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" That has been the opinion expressed by various members. That question will come up when the advisory committee meets again."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Is the hon. Minister going to table a resolution or arrive at a decision by means of conversation? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" By tabling a resolution or by means of conversation."

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—" May I know what stands in the way of the temple committees being formed? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" Money."

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—" Will the Government be pleased to find a way out through the agency of the Endowments Board? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" We did consult the Board but they have expressed inability to find funds."

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—" May I know whether it is a fact that so far as the revenues are concerned, these temples pay revenues but still do not get the benefit of the Act? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" That is a matter of opinion."

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—" Was it not proposed to introduce an amending Bill even this session? "

[2nd August 1932

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"We wanted to introduce one, but there are still some matters on which some consultation is necessary."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether it is the opinion of the Government that temple committees as contemplated under the Act have not been constituted on account of financial reasons?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"Yes."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether in the case of any of the temple committees which had its election list ready and which applied for permission for election Government have refused permission?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"No, Sir. In Tanjore, Tinnevelly and South Arcot, elections were held and the elected committees are now functioning. We have not turned down the request of any committee."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR:—"Why are not committees elected in Madura, Coimbatore, Trichinopoly and some others, where I believe they have money?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"The committees could not be constituted by election."

Agriculture

Development of the cultivation of fruits and vegetables.

* 36 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have taken any steps to develop the cultivation of fruits and vegetables for the market as suggested by the Royal Commission on Agriculture;

(*b*) whether any horticultural research is being done by the Department of Agriculture in this Province; and

(*c*) whether any course of training in fruit culture or in the preservation of fruits and vegetables is given at the Coimbatore Agricultural College?

A.—(*a*) A scheme has been submitted to the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research for financial help for opening a fruit research station in the plains; a survey of fruit cultivation and marketing in the Central Districts has been recently started and measures to help the export of plantains to Northern India are receiving attention.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) Lectures on fruit culture are given at the College where an orchard is maintained for instructional purposes. The study of preservation of fruits and vegetables has not yet been taken up by the Department.

2nd August 1932]

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—" May I ask the hon. Minister whether the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Agriculture regarding the cultivation of fruits and vegetables have ever been considered by the Government? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" Yes."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—" With regard to (b), may I know whether any special officer has been deputed for the purpose? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" No special officer has been deputed."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—" As this is a very important section of agriculture, why have not Government appointed a special officer for this purpose? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" No funds to appoint one."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—" With regard to the latter part of the answer to (a), may I ask what is being done in the matter of marketing? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" I may say, Sir, that the Director of Agriculture has said that he would depute one of the officers of his department and he would also write to the Directors of Agriculture in other provinces in that matter."

Mr. K. Koti Reddi:—" What steps do the Government propose to take to improve the cultivation of fruits? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" Experiments in cultivation have been done at some stations. Nothing has been done so far as marketing is concerned."

Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder:—" May I know why this Government does not think in the lines of other Governments in other Provinces who are helping the ryots in the matter of marketing? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" I am not aware of things being done by other Governments. Whatever is possible by this Government will be done."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" May I know whether free advice is made available to the ryots who are interested in cultivation of fruits from the department of Agriculture? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" Certainly. If any advice is sought, the department is prepared to give it."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" Free of cost? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" Yes."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—" May I know whether there is any officer in that department who can be called an expert in fruit culture? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" I do not think any one can be called an expert."

[2nd August 1932

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I ask what is the nature of the advice given?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"There are officers in the department who know something about fruits; but as I said, they are not experts."

Registration

Opening of a new Sub-registry Office at Perdal.

* 37 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether any sub-registry offices have been closed in Malabar this year; and

(*b*) whether the Government propose to open a new office at Perdal in South Kanara?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) No.

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—"May I know whether representations have not been made time and again regarding this matter?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"I am not aware of it."

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—"May I know whether representations were made to the hon. Minister when he visited South Kanara?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"That was three years ago."

Veterinary

Closure of Veterinary dispensaries.

* 38 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of veterinary dispensaries that have been closed this year as a measure of retrenchment; and

(*b*) the number of touring billets that have been abolished for effecting retrenchment?

A.—(*a*) Four.

(*b*) Six.

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I know whether the Government means to say that some schemes came up and they were pending and have all been disposed of?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—"No, Sir."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"Do I understand him correctly—I say that no schemes were ever sent up?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—"No scheme ever reached the Government."

2nd August 1932]

Education

Introduction of compulsory elementary education in Salem and South Arcot districts.

*39 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) in how many areas of the South Arcot and Salem districts has compulsory elementary education been introduced, and what they are;

(*b*) how many proposals for the introduction of compulsory education from the municipal and local authorities in the districts of Salem, South Arcot and Coimbatore are pending before the Government for sanction; and

(*c*) what they are, and when the Government propose to dispose of them ?

A.—(*a*) In none of the areas in the districts.

(*b*) None.

(*c*) Does not arise.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS

Prisons and Prisoners

Classification of Mr. B. Krishnaswami Mudaliyar as a 'C' class prisoner.

40 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. RANGASWAMI REDDI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the rules are that are observed in classifying the prisoners convicted on account of Civil Disobedience Movement as A, B and C classes;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that B. Krishnaswami Mudaliyar of Arni in the district of North Arcot was arrested on the 15th February 1932 on account of the Civil Disobedience Movement and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year and placed in 'C' class; and

(*c*) whether the hon. the Law Member has been pleased to enquire into the position of the prisoner before classification ?

A.—(*a*) The rules relating to classification of convicts will be found in the Press Communiqué No. 219, dated 19th March 1930, published on pages 456–458 of Part I of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 25th March 1930.

(*b*) Yes: except that the convict was in addition sentenced to pay a fine of Rs. 100 or in default to undergo rigorous imprisonment for six weeks.

(*c*) Yes.

Alleged ill-treatment of women in Vellore Jail.

41 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. RANGASWAMI REDDI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the jail authorities in the Vellore jail remove the *kumkum* from the forehead of married women who are confined in that jail, and if so, the authority under which they are so acting; and

(*b*) whether it is a fact that only two meals are given for C class prisoners, one between 12 noon and 1 p.m. and another between 4 and 5 p.m., and that children are not given anything till 12 noon?

A.—(*a*) The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative and that to the second part does not arise.

(*b*) The hon. Member is referred to rules 347 and 836 (3) of the Madras Jail Manual.

Famine Relief

Economic distress in the Bellary district.

42 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have been receiving reports from local officers about the seasonal conditions in the Bellary district;

(*b*) whether the Government are aware of the prevalence of acute agricultural distress in the taluks of Bellary and Alur and parts of Siruguppa and Rayadrug;

(*c*) how long do they expect to continue the present test which has already been tried beyond the required period of fifteen days;

(*d*) whether the attendance during the test stage has not justified the conversion of these works into relief works;

(*e*) what the wage earned per day is in every one of the camps by a man, woman and child during test stage; and

(*f*) whether the Government will be pleased to lay on the table the reports of the Collector and the Famine Commissioner on the economic distress in the district immediately before the test stage?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to paragraph 1 of the Press Communiqué [a] issued on 29th June 1932, a copy of which is appended. The Government are aware that there has been a failure of crops in the area mentioned; the reliefs detailed in the Press Communiqué and the opening of test works are measures taken by the Government to meet the situation.

(*c*) & (*d*) The hon. Member is referred to the concluding portion of the Press Communiqué issued on 29th June 1932. No period of 15 days has been specified as the maximum for a test-work.

(*e*) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clause (*e*) of question No. 26.

(*f*) The Government received a report under section 46 (*a*) of the Famine Code from the Commissioner of Land Revenue and Settlement but consider it unnecessary to lay it on the table of the Legislative Council.

---

[a] Printed as Appendix VI on pages 115–117 infra.

Relief works in Bellary district.

43 *Q*.—Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Famine Code applies when only a few taluks of a district in a presidency are affected;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that in 1926-27 on the representations of the then Collector, Mr. Crofton, the Famine Code was held inapplicable in such a situation;

(*c*) whether the same view was adopted for the first five months this time when about 20,000 labourers were employed upon making useful roads and drinking wells and ponds with a living wage of 3 annas to 1 anna;

(*d*) what the recommendations were of the Famine Commissioner who visited the camps in the Bellary district several times during these five months;

(*e*) why were his recommendations and those of the Collector and of the president, district board, turned down and the test works started which ought to have been initiated at the very beginning if there was an idea of application of Famine Code;

(*f*) how many relief camps were working before test stage and how many were closed when test works were ordered;

(*g*) what the wage that is earned by a man, a woman and boy or girl during the test stage is;

(*h*) what the cost is of running a camp at the test stage and what the cost was of running it before the test stage; and

(*i*) now that the test has been submitted to and people have been flocking to camps why there is delay in converting them into relief works?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) No. The hon. Member, as President, District Board, Bellary, suggested in 1927 that instead of opening famine camps, grants might be made to the District Board in order to carry ont certain works for the employment of labour. Mr. Crofton supported the suggestion.

(*c*) The method of providing employment that was adopted in 1927 was adopted this year up to the last week of May.

(*d*) The Commissioner of Land Revenue and Settlement visited the district in February and May and made various recommendations.

(*e*) The hon. Member is referred to paragraph 4 of the Press Communiqué issued on 29th June 1932, which gives the reasons for the change in the system. Under section 33-A of the Famine Code, the Collector, if he considers that the measure of unemployment on account of adverse season is likely to be serious and to lead to distress, should, among other things, move the local boards to expand their programme of ordinary works. If the preliminary measures do not materially improve the outlook, he should open test works. The procedure adopted by the Government was in no way at variance with the provisions of the Famine Code.

[2nd August 1932

(*f*) There were no famine relief camps before the test works were opened; if the hon. Member is referring to the works carried on as an expansion of ordinary works he is referred to the answers to clauses (*b*) and (*d*) of question No. 26.

(*g*) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clause (*e*) of question No. 26.

(*h*) The Government have not the information.

(*i*) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clause (*c*) of question No. 42.

Land Revenue Administration

Appointment of outsiders as Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars in Anantapur district.

44 *Q.*—Mr. G. LAKSHMANA REDDI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that outsiders have been imported into the Anantapur district as Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars; and

(*b*) whether the Government have received any representations to the effect that the prospects of the officers of the Revenue subordinate service in the district have consequently suffered?

A.—(*a*) The Government have not the information.

(*b*) No.

Enumeration of livestock in this Province.

45 *Q.*—Mr. K. SINGAM AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state in detail the method or methods employed in enumerating the livestock of this province and the steps taken to ensure that they allow of no inaccuracies creeping into the statistical records?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is drawn to the instructions for preparing Village Account No. 21 and the form of that account contained in the "Revised Forms of Village Accounts." Usually Village Officers are assembled at convenient centres in advance of the quinquennial census and the instructions in the Manual are explained to them by Revenue Officers.

Public Service

Age-limit of Viswabrahmans for entry into public service.

46 *Q.*—Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether any decision has been arrived at with regard to raising the age-limit of the Viswabrahmana community from 25 to 30 years for entry into Government service;

(b) whether any proposal was sent to the Government by the Madras Services Commission that unless the age-limit of Viswabrahman candidates was raised from 25 to 28 years for appearing before the Services Commission Examinations it would be impossible to provide proper representation of the community in public services; and

(c) the orders of the Government regarding the same?

A.—(a) No such question has been considered.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

Local Self-Government

Memorial from the employees of Mangalore Municipality regarding contribution to their provident fund.

47 Q.—Mr. M. S. Sreshta: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether he has received any memorial from the employees of the Mangalore municipality on the subject of contribution to their provident fund;

(b) whether the point raised involves any legal difficulties;

(c) whether the Government have obtained legal opinion and, if so, with what result;

(d) what other action, if any, has been taken on the memorial; and

(e) whether any and, if so, what orders have been passed thereon?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) & (c) No.

(d) & (e) As the Government cannot permit any deviation from the Provident Fund Rules issued in a statutory form, the memorialists were informed that their request cannot be complied with.

Publication of annual statistics regarding cow slaughter.

48 Q.—Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are proposing to instruct municipalities to give statistics regarding cow slaughter in their annual administration reports; and

(b) if not, why not?

A.—(a) No.

(b) The Government do not consider that any public purpose would be served by calling for the information.

Slaughter of cattle beyond municipal and cantonment limits.

49 Q.—Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state the approximate number of cows and bullocks slaughtered every year in the areas beyond municipal and cantonment limits?

A.—The Government have no information.

Resolutions by municipalities regarding prohibition of cow slaughter.

50 *Q.*—Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) the names of such municipalities in this Presidency that have passed resolutions prohibiting cow slaughter or restricting slaughter of milch cattle in their prime age;

(*b*) whether they have been allowed to carry out the resolutions by Government without any check; and

(*c*) if not, the reasons therefor?

A.—(*a*) Resolutions on the subject passed by the following municipal councils came to the notice of Government:—

1. Anakapalle.	6. Guntur.
2. Masulipatam.	7. Nellore.
3. Coimbatore.	8. Erode.
4. Bezwada.	9. Palacole.
5. Vizagapatam.	10. Chingleput.

The Coimbatore Municipal Council subsequently rescinded its resolution.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) The Government were advised that it is not open to a municipal council to prohibit the slaughtering of cows and cattle within municipal limits and that any resolution or a bylaw framed by the council prohibiting it will be ultra vires.

Medical Administration

Enquiry into the trouble among students in the Government School of Indian Medicine.

51 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Minister for Local-Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the hon. Member is aware of the trouble caused among the students of the Government School of Indian Medicine, Madras, on the 17th February 1932;

(*b*) whether the Government have received any memorial from certain advocates of Madras who witnessed the incident;

(*c*) if so, what action the Government have taken; and

(*d*) whether the Government have received any report from the Principal of the School of Indian Medicine ?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Government have received a copy of a statement issued to the press by some advocates who held an enquiry into the matter. No advocate witnessed the incident.

(*c*) It was forwarded to the Principal, Indian Medical School.

(*d*) The Principal has made a final report on the matter.

2nd August 1932]

Registration of L.I.M.'s.

52 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether he has made any arrangement for the registration of the Licentiate of Indian Medicine; and

(*b*) if not, why not; and

(*c*) when he expects to be able to decide the question of registering the L.I.M.'s ?

A.—(*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) The Central Board of Indian Medicine, constituted to advise Government on matters relating to Indian Medicine, has formulated proposals for the registration of L.I.M.'s. They are under consideration.

Supervision of L.I.M.'s working in rural dispensaries.

53 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether he is aware of the fact that the L.I.M.'s are working in rural dispensaries;

(*b*) what provision he has made for supervising their work and the dispensaries; and

(*c*) if he has not yet made any, what he intends doing and when ?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The Government have decided that till the question of constituting a suitable inspecting agency for these institutions is settled, their control and supervision should vest in the local boards concerned.

(*c*) The Principal, Government Indian Medical School, has separately forwarded the proposals of the Central Board of Indian Medicine for the appointment of Inspecting Medical Officers for supervising the work of the medical practitioners in charge of the institutions of Indian Medicine. The proposals are under the consideration of Government.

Opening a Central Store of Indian Medicine.

54 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state, what arrangements he is going to make for opening a Central Store of Indian Medicine ?

A.—Proposals for opening a Central Store of Indian Medicine were deferred pending the constitution of the Central Board of Indian Medicine to advise Government on matters relating to Indian Medicine. The question will now be taken up in consultation with the Central Board which has since been constituted.

[2nd August 1932

Village Panchayats

Travelling allowance of an Honorary Organizer of Village Panchayats.

55 *Q.*—Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the minimum and maximum amount is that can be drawn as travelling allowance by a Taluk Honorary Organizer of Village Panchayats according to rules, if any;

(*b*) how many times they are expected to tour in the year and whether they are required to maintain diaries regarding the nature of their work in villages; and

(*c*) the number of Honorary Organizers of Village Panchayats in the district of Kistna and the area allotted to each of the said Honorary Organizers of Village Panchayat Boards?

A.—(*a*) There are no fixed minima or maxima. A fixed allowance of Rs. 2 a day is given to honorary organizers for journeys performed beyond a radius of five miles from their headquarters under the specific orders of the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.

(*b*) No minimum touring has been prescribed. They are required to maintain diaries.

(*c*) The information is furnished below:—

Taluk.	Number of honorary organizers.
Kaikalur	3
Bezwada	1
Tiruvur	1
Gudivada	2
Gannavaram	1

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

IV.—ACTS ASSENTED TO BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I have to announce that the undermentioned Acts received the assent of His Excellency the Governor on the dates mentioned against each:—

(1) The Madras Cotton Control Act—28th April 1932.

(2) The Madras Co-operative Societies Act—9th May 1932."

V.—PANEL OF CHAIRMEN.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I have to anuounce to the House that under rule 3 of the Madras Legislative Council Rules, I have nominated the following four Members of the Council to be a Panel of Chairmen for this session of the Council:—

(1) Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam.

(2) Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.

(3) Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.

(4) Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan."

VI.—ELECTION OF FIVE MEMBERS TO THE SENATE OF THE ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The Vice-Chancellor of the Annamalai University having requested me that arrangements may be made for the election, according to the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote, of five Members of this Council to the Senate of that University, I have directed that the elections should be held in accordance with the Regulations made under Standing Order No. 80. In accordance with these Regulations, I fix 2 p.m. on the 3rd August 1932 as the latest time by which notice of nominations may be sent to the Secretary.

" If the number of candidates nominated exceeds the number of vacancies to be filled, there will be an election between 12 noon and 3 p.m. on the 4th August 1932."

VII.—HOUSE COMMITTEE.

* The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— 1
" I beg to move—

> ' *that, with a view to appoint a House Committee in pursuance of Standing Order No. 84, this Council do proceed to elect six Members to be Members of the said Committee according to the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote* '."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have to inform the House that with reference to Regulation II of the Regulations for the holding of elections by means of the single transferable vote, I fix 3 p.m. to-day as the time by which the nominations of candidates for election to the House Committee should be sent to the Secretary."

VIII.—DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1932-33.

GRANT VI—IRRIGATION (EXCLUDING CAUVERY-METTUR PROJECT)—RESERVED.

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

> ' *that Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 58,300 under Grant VI—Irrigation (excluding Cauvery-Mettur Project)—Reserved* '.

" Sir, this grant is required for four works which are indicated on the agenda paper. The first of these is to provide for the realignment of the Godavari flood bank on the Polavaram Island. The flood bank was seriously eroded between miles 3/3 and 4/4 this year. The cheapest way of remedying this is to realign the bank from mile 3, so that it will run alongside the local fund earthen road from Amalapur to Yenam. The work is estimated to cost Rs. 21,000. As it is urgent and should be carried out this year, the Government have authorized the starting of the work. As the expenditure can be met by reappropriation, I ask for a token grant of Rs. 100 only.

[Sir Archibald Campbell] [2nd August 1932

"The next item is to provide for the contribution to be made towards the cost of the Central Board of Irrigation. A Central Bureau of Information on irrigation matters has been established by the Government of India for various purposes such as the dissemination of technical information, contact with other countries through publications so as to be in touch with up-to-date methods of engineering, maintenance of a technical library, liaison between the provinces so that the experience gained in one place may be usefully employed at another place, publicity for the purpose of educating public opinion, co-ordination of research work and publication of general and technical papers. The Government of India have asked the various local Governments to subscribe towards its maintenance, the contribution from the Central Government being limited to Rs. 2,500 per annum. The share of the Madras Government has been fixed at Rs. 7,500 per annum. I have therefore come forward with a token demand for Rs. 100, as the required amount can be found by reappropriation.

"The next item refers to the purchase of two new dredgers for Kistna Central Division. The existing grab dredgers Nos. 7 and 8 were purchased about forty years ago and have worked continuously every season. They are now worn out, repair charges have become very heavy and their working is very uneconomical. Further expenditure on the existing grab dredgers would be waste of money. The replacement of the dredgers has become imperatively necessary. It is estimated that these dredgers will cost about Rs. 85,000, of which we hope to find Rs. 27,000, by reappropriation.

"The fourth item relates to the diversion of Tamparaparni flood banks at the Attur Eral and Settupatti sets. As hon. Members are aware there has been a considerable amount of damage done in recent years by floods in the Tamparaparni. High floods in the Tamparaparni in December 1931 caused a number of breaches in the left flood bank above and below the Srivaikuntam anicut. We hope by diverting the flood bank to obviate the difficulties. The Chief Engineer has submitted an estimate amounting to Rs. 28,100, for protecting the right bank of the river at Attur. He has himself approved of two other smaller estimates amounting to Rs. 18,800 and Rs. 10,500 for forming diversion banks at the Eral and Settupatti sets. I have therefore to move for a token grant of Rs. 100, as the money can be found by reappropriation."

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask the hon. the Revenue Member whether the scale of expenditure on the establishment of the Central Bureau of Information as proposed by the Government of India is justifiable? To me it seems that the expenditure is extravagant, because I happened to be a member of the Government of India Sub-Committee that dealt with this question and I know how money is being spent. It should not be understood that I am in any way opposing this grant, more especially as the amount is required for the establishment of a Board of Engineers concerning irrigational problems. But to me it seems that the scale of expenditure is not altogether justifiable.

2nd August 1932] [Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

" Then, Sir, with reference to the purchase of two new dredgers for Kistna Central Division, I wish to know whether it is not possible to carry on the work with the existing dredgers only for some more years by repairing them."

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" Sir, the maximum total expenditure which is likely to be incurred by the Central Board of Irrigation is about Rs. 47,500. I am afraid I have not got details of the actual items of expenditure. But I will certainly ask the Government of India to give us those details.

" As regards the purchase of new dredgers, the existing dredgers were purchased in 1893 and they have been working ever since. The machinery has become worn out, the main crankshafts were broken in 1930 and have been temporarily patched up; the boiler of one has been condemned and the working pressure of the other has been reduced from 80 lb. to 60 lb.; the repairing charges are very heavy. I will however communicate the suggestions of my hon. Friend Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar to the Chief Engineer and ask him whether the expenditure can be safely reduced by adopting them."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

GRANT XXI—AGRICULTURE—TRANSFERRED.

* The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor I beg to move—

> '*that Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100, under Demand XXI—Agriculture—Transferred.*'

" Sir, this sum is required for making provision for carrying out experiments in connexion with dry cultivation in the lower Bhavani project. Sir, in connexion with this scheme the Director of Agriculture has proposed to make certain experiments in consultation with the Irrigation department. These experiments are considered to be necessary and they have to be carried out immediately. The duration of these experiments will be about ten months. The items of expenditure are given in the Explanatory Memorandum. After all the expenditure can be met by reappropriation in the present year's budget. I hope the House will grant this demand."

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" I beg to move—

> '*that the grant be reduced by Re. 1.*'

" At the outset I may remark that I think that this grant should rather come under an Irrigation Demand rather than under an Agricultural Demand. But the object with which I have moved this amendment is to ask the Government the grounds on which they have made up their minds to treat this Lower Bhavani project as a dry crop scheme and not as a wet crop scheme. I should like to know the data on which they have come to this conclusion. The principle on which irrigation schemes are classed as dry crop or wet crop is briefly as follows. A dry crop scheme can only succeed when the total annual rainfall

[Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar] [2nd August 1932

or the seasonal rainfall is so low as to necessitate the demand for irrigation water. Whereas in the case of areas where the average rainfall is sufficiently great, dry crop schemes are impossible. If you look at the rainfall on the Lower Bhavani area you will find that it varies from 20 to 40 inches. An area where the average rainfall is about 30 inches is, in my opinion, entirely unsuited for dry crop irrigation schemes, because the ryot will get what he wants from the rainfall alone. I should therefore like to know on what grounds the Government have come to the conclusion to treat the Lower Bhavani scheme which was originally designed as a wet crop scheme, as a dry crop scheme. The total area commanded is not more than two or three times the wet irrigation area originally proposed under the Lower Bhavani scheme. Do the Government hope to get a sufficient area of dry crop irrigation to justify the scheme and make it productive? It seems to me that before you go on with experiments on demands of water for various kinds of dry crops and so forth, these fundamental questions will have to be discussed, considered and answered. Have the Government done that?

"I shall now come to the question of these dry crop experiments. I do not know how the proposal originated. We have got, if not in this Presidency, certainly in this country, an enormous amount of literature on this question of dry crop irrigation. It has been in vogue ever since irrigation started in the Punjab and the United Provinces and for years and years irrigation officers in these Provinces have conducted experiments, collected data and published them. Have the Government studied all this? How did they find out the necessity for further experiments? What will they find after experimenting on an area of 16 acres for a period of ten months? Why should they discard the mass of information that is available? Why do they not base their schemes on the enormous data that are available to anyone who is willing to go into them? Do the Government think that they can get any reliable data from their experiments conducted for a period of ten months? I should rather think that the experiments should go on for a period of ten years. Because, to put only one objection, when your experiments are going on you may get rainfall. What inference will you draw as to the total requirements of water for a particular acreage on which you are experimenting? It seems to me, Sir, that the proposal does not fully take into account not merely the mass of information available on the subject but even the elementary requirements of a case like this. Assuming that we have not got any data available on this question, to say that by experiments conducted in a small area over a short period of ten months we will be able to collect data sufficiently satisfactory to base our schemes on is, I think, nothing short of absurdity. Rainfall varies from year to year; in one year we have 20 inches and in another year we have 40 inches. Must you not at least carry on experiments over a period of five or six years so that you may exhaust the varying conditions of rainfall from year to year? I doubt very much whether the scheme now put before the House has been well considered. As I said before, the scheme was worked out as a wet

crop scheme many years ago for very adequate reasons. I fail altogether to see the reasons which have induced the Government to alter their minds, I do not even know if they have altered their decision or whether they are simply going to experiment with dry crop irrigation and then go back to wet crop irrigation. I merely ask for information on all these points. I should like that this question is postponed until we know the elementary facts about this thing. Otherwise, I am afraid they will be conducting experiments which may prove perfectly futile and thoroughly inadequate.

"Again, supposing there were no data available at all, why should not the Government conduct these experiments on their Coimbatore Central Farm itself? They have a big establishment there. There is a channel from the Noyyal river passing through the farm; there are wells provided with pumps. There are all kinds of soils. Why do not the Government select a plot there and ask the Farm Establishment to collect this information? It is the work of the Agricultural Department and if they have not got the information already they will do well to collect it now. I should like my hon. Friend to answer these questions if he can."

* Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"Mr. President, my hon. Friend, the Chief Minister, thinks that these experiments should be conducted also for the Ceded districts. I entirely agree with him. I will say for his information and for the information of his hon. Colleague that, long, long ago, the Agricultural department wanted to find out whether the dry lands in the Ceded districts could be profitably irrigated or not. It was with that object that the Hagari Farm was started. Different experiments were proposed to be conducted there with reference to dry, and possibly wet, crops also. As my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, has pointed out, there are lands already in the possession of the Government where the experiments under contemplation by the Government could be conducted. I do not see the need for acquiring or leasing fresh lands when already they have lands of different kinds at their disposal. After all there is no reliability in the results of experiments, conducted over a short period. Some peculiar and unexpected conditions may crop up and make the results unsafe for any definite inference to be drawn from them. I therefore think that the hon. the Minister will be well advised to drop this scheme and see if he cannot carry out systematic experiments on the different soils already in the possession of Government."

* Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—"Sir, the Government have two objects in the experiments they are going to conduct! The first is to find out the water requirements of dry crops and the second is to obtain data with regard to first and second crop avacuts. So far as the second object is concerned I have the least objection to it. It is very necessary. But I have my own misgivings with regard to the first object. When the Upper Bhavani project was taken up the Government deputed an I.C.S. officer to investigate the water requirements of dry crops. What the Special Officer did we do not know. The people of Coimbatore do not know the gentlemen whom

the Special Officer interviewed in the areas in which he was conducting his investigation. But all of a sudden we heard that the Special Officer had reported that with regard to the Upper Bhavani project dry crop irrigation would be a failure. He seems to have reported that owing to the loss of water due to evaporation and to heavy absorption on account of the porosity of the soil, the scheme will not succeed. I have my own misgivings that with regard to the Lower Bhavani project also the Government might say that the water that can be stored under the Lower Bhavani project will not be sufficient for dry crop irrigation and the project should be abandoned. Therefore I want an assurance from the hon. Minister for Public Works and the hon. Member for Irrigation that at the end of these experiments they will not say that the scheme will be a failure and should therefore be abandoned. I am anxious that the Government should not repeat the history of the Upper Bhavani project in the case of the Lower Bhavani project also."

* Mr. S. H. SLATER:—" Mr. President, Sir, the amendment moved by the hon. Member opposite would have the effect of giving a wider scope to the discussion than was intended by the Government. The hon. Member raised the question whether the Government have considered and made up their minds finally as to whether the Lower Bhavani project should be undertaken as a wet irrigation project or a project for the irrigation of dry crops. He seemed to think that no consideration had been paid to the immense volume of literature on the subject of dry crop irrigation which has been collected in various parts of India. I have no doubt that that literature has been carefully studied, and though I am not departmentally in a position to say whether the Government have finally decided the question or not, I imagine that the experiment now proposed is one of the factors which will be taken
15 n. into consideration before the final decision is made. But certainly, speaking as one guilty or, at any rate, responsible, to a certain extent for the latest reports from the district on this point, I have personally endeavoured to support the case for taking up the Lower Bhavani scheme as a dry project. In this connexion there was one point mentioned by my hon. Friend Mr. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar to which I must refer. He seemed apprehensive whether in view of the discouraging and frigid report which caused the abandonment of the Upper Bhavani project we are justified in conducting this experiment on the Lower Bhavani, and whether we would not meet with precisely the same difficulties and disappointments. I think it necessary to point out that this is a very much more modest scheme with a much shorter main channel which will obviate a great deal of the loss or wastage of water. The intention is to provide this irrigation as supplementary to the crops which are raised by rainfall at present. The most delicate part of the task of the Engineering department is to arrange for a supply of water so as to coincide with the season in each half of its area when the rainfall is at its lowest. The object of this little experiment, of which my hon. Friend opposite spoke with apparent contempt, is to educate the ryot as to the advantages, in that particular area, of dry crop irrigation as compared with wet crop irrigation.

2nd August 1932] [Mr. S. H. Slater]

"In order to ensure that the cultivators in that area will be ready to accept the scheme and agree to pay the water-rate it is considered desirable by the Director of Agriculture—whose opinion the Government have accepted—that the ryot should be shown by experiments on his own ground—in his own area and not elsewhere—the advantages which will accrue, and the amount of water that will be required actually in practice. The experiments should be conducted in the very area of the project and not elsewhere in other parts of India. We want to make experiments in the very area which is going to be benefited by this project.

"I think—if I may say so—the hon. Member who moved the amendment has deliberately ignored the explanatory note which accompanied the Demand for this Grant. It says:—'At present the ryot, after shallow cultivation, irrigates his land grown with cholam, cumbu or ragi once in five or six days. The issue is whether land with the same crops may be irrigated at longer intervals, say, once in ten days, whether with shallow or deep cultivation.' This is the justification for this minor experiment, which is covered by the demand for this supplementary grant, which the hon. Minister has brought forward. I therefore oppose the amendment. I hope the House will not be tempted to follow the hon. Member in a general excursion into the relative advantages of wet and dry crop irrigation."

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"Sir, I am somewhat in a difficulty to find out as to what exactly the last speaker meant. I asked, Sir, whether the Government have definitely made up their minds. He has not told us whether they have made up their minds or not. My hon. Friend has completely ignored the question of rainfall, the suitability of the project and the total rainfall in that area. I want to know whether the hon. Minister has gathered the necessary information. What I suggested was that you could take advantage of the experience gained in other parts of India as it would be applicable with regard to the Lower Bhavani area. These two main points have not been answered at all. But of course it is not my intention to press my amendment because, after all, I am as much interested as my hon. Friend, the Minister in getting this project through without the least possible delay. It seems to me that these small experiments seem to be devised for delaying the carrying out of the scheme still further."

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

* Mr. K. Koti Reddi:—'Mr. President, Sir, I move—

'*that the Demand of Rs.* 100 *for Agriculture—Transferred, be reduced by Re.* 1.'

"I wish to know from the hon. Minister why similar experiments should not be made in the Ceded districts. My hon. Friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, has pointed out that there is great necessity for trying the same experiment in that area. I am glad that the Government has come forward to make these experiments in some area.

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi] [2nd August 1932

" Another point I wish to refer to is if the Government wants to take up the Tungabhadra or Tungabhadra-Kistna project in the Ceded districts, they should conduct experiments to see how far the dry black cotton soil can be utilized for irrigation purposes. The original Tungabhadra project was intended to supply water for dry cultivation, to supply water for cholam and cotton crops. With regard to the question of irrigating the black cotton soil, no experiments have so far been made. If the Tungabhadra-Kistna project has to be successfully worked out, some portions of dry lands may have to be utilized for irrigation purposes."

* The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" Sir, my hon. Friend in charge of Irrigation wanted these experiments to be conducted. If the Government propose to carry out the same experiments in other places, the Department of Agriculture will certainly be very glad to help. The Agricultural Department is only helping the Irrigation Department in finding out what amount of water will be required, say, for an acre. It has been pointed out that the period of 10 months is a very short one. If necessary, it may be extended. We shall then come before this House and ask for further sanction.

" With regard to the remarks of my hon. Friend, Mr. Koti Reddi, the Agricultural Department would be very glad to carry out experiments and give facilities to any portion of the Ceded districts, if new schemes are introduced there."

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

The main demand for Rs. 100 was put and carried and the grant made.

GRANT XXIX—CIVIL WORKS—TRANSFERRED AND RESERVED.

* The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

' *that the Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 under Grant XXIX—Civil Works—Transferred and Reserved.*'

" This demand is to provide for electric installation in the residences of Government Officers in Guntur. I do not think it is necessary to make out a case for the introduction of electric installation in these buildings. As is stated in the note, the amount required for this purpose can be met by reappropriation. The Government will not be a loser if this work is carried out as the amount will be recovered by way of increased rent for the buildings. I hope the Council would be pleased to pass this motion."

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

GRANT XXXII—FAMINE RELIEF—RESERVED.

* The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—" Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

' *that the Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 2,75,000 under Grant XXXII—Famine Relief—Reserved.*'

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

"In the present budget estimates which have been sanctioned, the amount allotted under this head is Rs. 25,000. That was made in order to meet expenditure immediately if necessary to combat famine in any area. Unfortunately owing to the failure of crops in a small portion of the Bellary district, namely, in portions of the Bellary taluk and adjacent taluks, it was found necessary by the local officers last December to provide work on certain ordinary works first and afterwards to expand them as a measure of relief. There are some test works under the Famine Code in this area to see whether it is necessary to introduce regular relief works or not. In order that we may be able to meet possible expenditure, I move that the Government be granted a further sum of Rs. 2,75,000."

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"Sir, I move—

'*that the Demand of Rs.* 2,75,000 *for Famine Relief—Reserved, be reduced by Rs.* 100'

in order to elicit information about the proposals of the Government and the progress made with reference to the Tungabhadra Project.

"Sir, the first point I would like to ask my hon. Friend about is what exactly are the Government's proposals with reference to famine or scarcity that is supposed to exist at present in the Bellary district? Up to June, I believe, the Government pursued the policy of expanding the local works carried on under the orders of the District Board. This system, as far as I have been able to ascertain from my friends in the Bellary district, has been giving satisfaction; and the wages earned by the workers, although they are not much, seemed on the whole to have given a fair amount of satisfaction. I would like to know why Government have now stopped these local board works and have started test works. The procedure no doubt is in accordance with the Famine Code; and apparently it has been based on the anticipation of the occurrence of what Government technically call 'famine'. I do not however know, Sir, the data on which this decision has been based.

"Before I proceed to make further remarks, I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friend the Revenue Member and of this House to the policy underlying the provisions of the Madras Famine Code. The Madras Famine Code, Sir, was drafted and brought into operation for dealing with cases of widespread famine at a time when communications and the progress and expansion of irrigation works were not what they are at present. Since those old days, communications have expanded, new lines of railway and new roads have been built, new irrigation works have come into existence; and to-day, Sir, except in the Ceded districts, one might well say that we would not have a recurrence of famine again in our province. The Ceded districts really remain to-day a blot on the administration; they have continued to be a blot in spite of incessant public demands, in spite of repeated suffering of the people, and in spite of repeated representations from all sides of this House that all measures

should be taken for combating famine in those districts. Therefore, remove this blot and save the Ceded districts from the possibility of *recurring famines.*

" I was talking, Sir, about the Famine Code. The system underlying the Famine Code is based on what I may call barbarism. Ideas of helping the unemployed have changed all over the world; and to-day, Sir, I think India with its Famine Code stands unique in presenting to the world a spectacle of doles or famine wages that have no parallel anywhere else in the world.

" Sir, the policy that has been advocated by the numerous Famine Commissions that have sat to consider this question of the avoidance of famine and by the Irrigation Commission in addition, has been the construction of irrigation works drawing their supplies from unfailing sources; and they all thought that was the only satisfactory remedy. Government are aware of it; but to-day, as I have said, we remain where we were a hundred and fifty years ago. The question of the construction of a large irrigation work that would carry the fertilizing waters of the Tungabhadra river through these districts which are known to be subjected to repeated famines, has been considered by Commission after Commission. We have had investigation after investigation made, all with the same result,—that the estimates have been shelved for the time being. Last of all, we had an investigation recently, and now we are again told what we all know already—that this question is under correspondence with the Government of His Exalted Highness, the Mysore Government and so on and so forth. But what we would like to know, Sir, is whether Government cannot make up their mind once for all to get through with this scheme, to take such measures as may be necessary to arrive at an expeditious decision—a decision which can only be arrived at by the personal initiative and energy of the highest officers of Government who have to deal with this question.

" Sir, I hope my friend, the hon. the Revenue Member, will be able to give us a satisfactory answer to this question as to when they would arrive at a decision concerning the Tungabhadra project. Will he take it up as a personal matter and push through the scheme? For, if he does it, he will earn the everlasting gratitude of the many thousands inhabiting these districts, who have been time and again suffering unspeakable horrors from repeated famines. It is, Sir, a task which might fire the enthusiasm and energy of any man entrusted with it—a task of great magnitude and beneficence. I hope, Sir, my hon. Friend will rise to the occasion.

" Concerning the test works started, I was saying that the Famine Code as it stands to-day is a relic of the barbarous ideas that obtained thirty or forty years ago. One has only to look at the provisions of the Famine Code to find out the way in which the wages are arrived at, and also to realize how cruel and totally out of date these provisions are. In fact, I consider it necessary that the Government should alter the policy underlying the Famine Code altogether. My friend would no doubt tell me that that is a matter for the Government of India to decide; but

2nd August 1932] [Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

surely this Government has a voice, and must have a powerful voice in deciding the policy in a matter of this kind. I would beg leave of the House, Sir, to read a sentence from the Introduction to the Famine Code:

' . . . Though the State is bound to protect the people from starvation in times of distress, it is no part of its duty to maintain them at their normal level of comfort or to insure them against all suffering, and that its interference should impair as little as possible the traditional and family obligations of the social system of the country, such, for instance, as those involved in the relationship of the members of a family, of landholder and farm-labourer, of master and servant, of alms-giver and alms-receiver.'

" Sir, I hope the Government will consider that this policy is entirely out of date. It certainly does not satisfy civilized opinion. It would not satisfy civilized opinion in any country of the world, and we ought therefore to protest against this policy here. In other countries where there is suffering and starvation, where there is unemployment, the Government comes to the relief of the people in the shape of free doles; but here, Sir, tasks are set to these poor suffering people, those tasks are enforced, and the wages are calculated on what Government call ' minimum rations '—just enough to keep body and soul together, to prevent death from starvation. That, Sir, they say is the policy of the Government, and that is the policy underlying the Famine Code—just to prevent people dying and nothing more. They can starve, they can deteriorate—and the Famine Code is blind and deaf to all that. They just give these people enough food to prevent them from death. Sir, I must protest against this policy, and in view of the situation in the Bellary district, in view of the dissatisfaction which these test works that have been started have created, and in view of the fact that there are many more useful ways of spending public money on public works of utility, I hope that the Government will see their way to continue the policy they were adopting hitherto, of providing relief to the unemployed by the construction and the continuation of ordinary public works of utility."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" The amendment is that the Demand of Rs. 2,75,000 be reduced by Rs. 100.

" Mr. Koti Reddi's amendment is covered by this amendment, and therefore he may speak on this amendment."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—" Mr. President, Sir, I have given notice of a similar amendment with a view to raise the same question, viz., whether the Government, instead of giving relief by taking up ordinary road works, will not be well-advised in spending the money on the proposed Tungabhadra project. It may be, Sir, that the Government may not come to a decision on this project for some years or even for a century; but everybody must admit that there must come a time when it will be taken up. At present the project is ready. The areas through which the big canals have to run are well-known and defined, and there is nothing more to trouble the Government, if they only make up their mind to spend money on those works which are immediately necessary for taking

up the Tungabhadra project. It may be, as I said, that Government may not be able to decide at once to take up the project; but seeing the necessity for a project of this magnitude, seeing the insistent demand for such a project in the Ceded Districts, seeing that it would save millions of people in those parts from famine, seeing also that there is a great amount of water available which is at present running to waste, Government may very well consider the advisability of spending this amount on the project. Seeing that all these conditions necessary for a big project are there, cannot the Government make up its mind, in the hope that this project will be taken up one day or the other, to spend money on the *construction of the proposed big canals, etc., in the Tungabhadra project,* instead of spending money on road works which are ill-maintained? We
-45 .m. cannot say whether the district boards are maintaining or can maintain the roads in good condition. So, Sir, Government will see its way to spend its money for the purpose of digging main canals, subsidiary canals, etc., in the Tungabhadra project. As my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar said, I appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member within the short time that may be available for this Government under the present system, to take up the project in right earnest, if necessary, with the concurrence of the Nizam's Government and the Mysore Government, and complete it within a reasonable period. The Ceded Districts Committee, I believe, recommended the Malappuram site for the reservoir. I once again appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member to take up this project on hand, and whether he comes to any conclusion about the desirability of the project being taken up in the near future or not, the money would be better spent if it is spent on digging canals under the Tungabhadra project immediately."

* Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—" Mr. President, Sir, the Government have been less than fair to the people affected by distress in the Bellary district. You will find from the Press Communiqué issued on 29th June 1932 that the Government were fully aware of the acute conditions prevailing in certain areas of that district. In order to afford some relief to the people affected, they started in December last several works and they gave the management thereof to the district boards. In doing so, they did not initiate any new policy, but they simply carried out the policy once pursued in 1927 and, I venture to say, successfully pursued. That went on up to April when conditions became worse and the Collector and the local authorities asked that more works should be started and the Government accordingly sanctioned additional works. But after a month or so, I believe, the Finance Department thought that, if the money which was being spent on these works was to be debited to the famine grant, the works should be carried on under the provisions of the Famine Code. One would expect, when such an objection was taken by the Finance Department, all that the Government should have done was to start famine relief works, because they were convinced of the distress, they had been carrying on the work for nearly four or five months and the works had been attracting a large number of people. If the Government had felt that they were technically wrong,

2nd August 1932] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

all that they should have done was to start relief works under the provisions of the Famine Code. But, instead of doing that, they wanted to start things right from the beginning by starting some test works to satisfy themselves whether there was distress in the area or not. You will see, Sir, from the figures furnished in the answers given to-day, that these works, with a higher standard of outturn, with less of wages and more of disabilities, still attracted a considerable large number of people. I find the works attracted as many as about 18,000 or 19,000 people; the number fell down, it again rose, but at any rate the figure remains somewhere about 13,000. (The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell: 12,000.) I stand corrected. How long is this test work to go on? You may ask me what is your objection to it? The work may be called by any name, but so long as works are in progress, people get some work to do though at some low wages. There is this difference between conditions which obtain under the test work system and the conditions which obtain under the famine relief system. I will enumerate them one by one. When the works are called test works, the coolies are asked to do somewhat more than they would be asked to do if the works are called relief works. This is number one. Under this system, they do not work on all the seven days of the week but they have what is called a rest day every week and on that day they do not work and get no wages at all. Whereas, if the works are called famine relief works, they will be paid wages for all the days in the week, including the rest day. Again, Sir, when the works are called test works, the dependents of the coolies who are actually working, do not get any relief at all; whereas, if it is relief work, the dependents of coolies who are actually working are fed in the kitchen. There is also gratuitous relief given to the disabled and the destitute.

"Now, Sir, the absence of facilities that would accrue to them if the works are relief works, is a very serious handicap to the people affected and I think the attitude of the Government in this matter is quite unjustifiable from my point of view. If they wanted to satisfy themselves of the need for relief works they have had more than ample time for it. Normally, 15 days is a reasonable time within which they may satisfy themselves whether the period of test should end and relief works should be taken on hand or not. In 1921, this very question was gone into and the then Member for Anantapur, Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai, and myself tabled a resolution and carried it in this House, to the effect that a committee should go into this matter thoroughly. Accordingly a committee was appointed and one of the things they had to enquire into was this, namely, the stringency of the test work conditions. The hardships complained of were: (1) that no allowances are given to dependents; (2) that no deductions are made for distances travelled; (3) that the interval between the test stage and the declaration of famine is long; (4) that the tasks enforced are high; and (5) that rest-day allowances are not given. That Committee went into these questions in detail and they came to some definite conclusions in regard to all of them. For example, as regards the last point they held that, 'there need be no rest-day nor any allowances therefor, but the workers should be permitted

to work on all days in the week '. They said that the distance should be calculated in assessing the outturn of work and they were emphatically of the opinion that the interval between the test stage and the declaration of famine should be the minimum possible. If, after 15 *days, it was found that the test works done did not draw* enough number of people, well, they might close the works and treat them as ordinary works. They went on to say that if the test works attracted a large number of people, then the works should be converted into relief works. I am quite aware of the fact that there is no categorical mention of the period within which a test work should be converted into a relief work. But, anybody who goes through the whole report, through the terms of the subsequent reference to the Committee, the order passed on that report and the report of the Committee and the modifications effected in the Famine Code, cannot but come to the conclusion that it was never contemplated that the test period should be prolonged to as long as two months, as it has been done in the present stage. In fact, you find in the Committee's report: 'We wish further to emphasize the fact that *there should be no avoidable delay in converting* test works *into* relief works '. That was the report of the Committee. At that time, there was *an impression on the part of certain Government officials that the* test works should continue as long as two months at least. About this, the Committee's view was—and the Government also agreed with the Committee—' in the tracts visited, we have noticed a mistaken impression on the part of some officials that the period of two months above referred to applies not only to the distribution of gratuitous relief, but also to the continuous attendance of a large number of workers. To avoid undesirable results of this misconception, we suggest the insertion of an explanatory note at the foot of the section '. In regard to the declaration of relief works, they gave power to the Board to say that the test works should be converted into relief works. They further stated, ' to go further, i.e., to seek in addition Government's approval for the conversion of the test works into relief work is in our opinion to court delay in a matter which brooks none and possibly to impose needless suffering at a stage when it has to be avoided most '. That is the remark of the Committee in this matter and the Government also agreed with them and modified the section in the Famine Code accordingly. Now, when all that has been done, it seems rather strange that the Government should be hesitating over this matter.

" The other day, the hon. the Revenue Member went over this area, and I dare say he has visited some of the places and seen many of the conditions under which these people work. He might probably have seen one or two coolies in a gang not working for full time. Probably, they had gone after the day's work of eight hours or after finishing their work early, or they might have gone to pick up some fuel for cooking. But, to base upon that general conclusion and to say that the people are not in need of any relief, I think, would be dangerous. The Famine Code does not give them anything for procuring fuel. I do not think the hon. the Revenue Member went into all the details of the matter or tried to find out the special circumstances under which the particular gang which he saw closed their work early and went away. Whatever it

2nd August 1932] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

may be, the very fact that as many as 12,000 people are working here day after day for a small wage shows conclusively that real distress exists there and there can be no reason whatsoever for delaying the conversion of these test works into relief works.

"In the Press Communiqué of the 29th June 1932, Government say that they have not seen signs of emaciation on the part of these people and so they would wait for some time more before they convert these test works into relief works. I think this is a dangerous position on the part of the Government to take, and it would be dangerous to wait for four or five months. I would also like to remind the hon. the Revenue Member that the Government should not think that the present famine policy is really to wait for emaciation and then give relief. Order on the report of the Committee is clear and the Government's principal business in famine relief has now come to be rather one of dealing with the unemployed and not of dealing with the absence or scarcity of food supplies. That was the position taken up by Government in 1923. I presume the Government have not changed their attitude since. Sir, in other countries, in England for example, unemployed are given cash doles, without any work being exacted. There the unemployed get about 15 sh. a week without doing anything to earn it. Here, we do not give the people anything without getting work from them in return for the money paid. All that is asked for is, give the people some work to do and then pay them, not what they would be getting in normal times, but just enough to enable them to make both ends meet. The wage that is given to these people is merely a subsistence wage and is not even sufficient for the actual needs of the worker concerned. It is not enough to feed the dependents of the people or the disabled persons dependent on them. I would only appeal to the Government to give up their indifferent, unsympathetic attitude in this matter and lose no time in ending this test work and beginning regular relief works." 1

* Mr. G. LAKSHMANA REDDI :—" Mr. President, Sir, I wish to speak a few words on this motion, and in doing so I should like to bring to the notice of the Government that the Ceded districts are hard hit in the matter of irrigation facilities. I think we ought to have got the Tungabhadra Scheme long before the Mettur Project. (Laughter.) Because, Sir, our parts have entirely to depend on rainfall for cultivation, and it is a well-known fact that we do not get sufficient rainfall in our parts. Of course, there are some tanks; they came into existence in the old, old days; but most of them have become silted up and our kind Government have not taken any steps to remove the accumulated silt, so much so these tanks are now of no use for cultivating crops.

"Then, Sir, some of our rivers are dammed up; the Pennar, the Hagari, the Jayamangali and the Chitravati are dammed up by the Mysore Government contrary to the agreement between the British Government and the Mysore Government. We have approached the British Government to see that that agreement is given effect to, but till now nothing has been done.

"Then, Sir, the Tungabhadra Project is hanging in the air and it is not known when it will become an accomplished fact. As such, I

[Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi] [2nd August 1932

request Government to realize that it is high time that something should be done by way of irrigation facilities to the ryots of the Ceded districts.

"With these words I support the motion."

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" Mr. President, Sir, some hon. Members on the other side of the House have referred to irrigation projects to benefit the Ceded districts and more especially to the Tungabhadra Project. They were anxious that that scheme should be pushed through, and they said that they would like to know how that scheme stands. I have on several previous occasions explained that we are carrying on negotiations with the Hyderabad Government and also with the Bombay Government and the Mysore Government, which are also affected by the scheme as the waters of the Tungabhadra pass through their territories or along their borders. I can assure hon. Members that I have been taking a personal interest in furthering this project. (Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: 'Hear hear.') Some time ago when I was acting as Irrigation Member I laid a suggestion to the Chief Engineer that we should endeavour to find another site for the main reservoir which would avoid submerging a portion of the Hyderabad territory either by making the dam higher up the river or by storing water in a reservoir not on the river itself, as in the case of the Sangam Project on the Pennar. These proposals were investigated and an alternative site for a dam on the river was selected. The erection of this dam will however lead to the submergence of a portion of Mysore State and Bombay presidency and we shall have to negotiate with them instead of the Hyderabad Government if that site is finally adopted. It appeared however possible that a joint scheme could be devised in the execution of which the Hyderabad Government might co-operate with us. I went to Hyderabad and placed this proposal before that Government and I am glad to say that they expressed their readiness to investigate this proposal and suggested that we should have a general investigation. Since then, the Hyderabad Government have, I believe, been investigating the possibility of utilizing Tungabhadra water on their side of the river, and I hope before long they will be in a position to forward their proposals, and then we can have a joint investigation of the scheme, as a result of which I hope that something may be done which will benefit the country on both sides of the river. That is the present position of the scheme. I can only now repeat, what I have already said, that I am most anxious to see this project pushed forward. I do realize the vital importance of the scheme to the people of the Ceded districts in the area affected by the project; and it is my desire that we should be able to start the Tungabhadara Project as soon as the Mettur Project is completed, so that we can utilize on the former much of the machinery that is being now used on the latter. That has been my aim all along and I can assure hon. Members that the scheme is being pushed forward as speedily as possible.

"As regards the damming up of the Pennar and the Hagari, the Local Government are carrying on correspondence with the Mysore

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

Government in that matter and endeavouring to set matters right in accordance with the Agreement which was signed many years ago by the Mysore and Madras Governments.

"As regards the Famine Code, to which Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar and Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar referred as being somewhat out of date and founded on conditions which no longer exist, I would remind them that though the Famine Code was started when conditions were very different from the present, it has been modified from time to time and has been considerably revised in comparatively recent years. We have taken into consideration the fact that communications have very much improved of late, thereby affecting the supply of grains and foodstuffs to all parts of the Presidency; we no longer depend for indications of famine upon local prices, because they are generally determined now more by outside conditions than by those subsisting in the particular areas concerned. I can remember days when we had to report periodically, I think once a month or once a week, whether famine price level had been reached. Those days are now gone, as that is no longer regarded as an adequate test. The object of the Famine Code is to prevent the waste of Government money in giving relief where it is really not necessary. It is the practice here for agricultural workers to receive such wages during the agricultural season as would enable them to tide over the slack season. The landowners and the ryots have to pay wages accordingly. I am quite sure if we started a work in the middle of the Kistna Delta in March or April we should get a certain number of people to come to it. Test works, admittedly, do not give such good conditions as full relief work, which are started only when it has been decided that it is necessary for the Government to do everything in its power to save people from starvation.

"Now, as regards the conditions existing in the Bellary district I recently paid a visit there. Various works are being carried out. These are road works and are useful; they will be handed over to local boards which will, I hope, complete and maintain them. These works are being carried out as test works under the Famine Code. As I have already observed the rates are raised 25 per cent over the rates provided in the Famine Code, because the price of condiments has not fallen to the same extent as that of the staple food, cholam. I went round some of the works. There are nominally seven test works; in fact, there are really 13 works, some of the works being clubbed together, though separated by some miles. I also visited certain villages and a market on market-day and made all sorts of inquiries. The works have only been recently organized as test works. The test works are cheaper now than when they were in the hands of the local board, as the board was paying higher rates of wages. During the last month the work of organization has been going on, but this cannot be done very easily and it is only now that the organization is becoming satisfactory. Auditors have only been recently appointed by the Accountant-General. It requires a certain amount of time to organize the works and administration so as to ensure that Government money is spent economically and that wages are fully paid to the coolies.

[Sir Archibald Campbell] [2nd August 1932

" Well, Sir, I found the condition of the people everywhere to be, what I would call, normal. There is no reason to think that they are unduly suffering. I do not say that if we had not taken these measures the people would not be in a worse condition than they are now. But I cannot say that I am satisfied that it is necessary that we should convert these works into relief works.

" As regards the particular works to which my hon. Friend referred, I found the labourers leaving the works early, about 2-30 or 3 o'clock. I inquired of them why they were going away so early and they replied that they were going for their meals and would come back; on inquiry, however I learnt they never did return after going off for their meals in the afternoon. I heard complaints on that work that the labourers were earning only one anna six pies instead of two annas one pie, and on inquiry I found the real cause to be what I have just narrated. There is no necessity for them to go away early and they could earn more if they stopped the whole day at the work."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar :—" Is it a daily-wage system, or a piece-wage system? "

* The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell :—" A combination of both. If they had done their task they get a full wage, and if they go away before doing the full task, they are paid less according to the amount of work done.

" Another work I found on the same road some three or four miles off. There too I found workmen going away at 3-30. In consequence, I must say I had some doubt whether it is necessary to keep that test work any longer, but as I was told that there was only a little more earth work to be done—there are only two gaps to be filled—and that it will take a fortnight or so to finish the work, I told the Collector that it is not necessary to close it at once, but the earthwork might be completed first."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar :—" May I know whether there is no limit to their hours of work? Are they to work all the 12 hours? "

* The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell :—" In most of the works they come about 8 o'clock or later and leave at about 4-30 or 5, I believe. On one work I visited there was nobody on the work at all in the afternoon. I was not going to mention that case as in that particular case there had been a very heavy shower of rain which would have rendered work very difficult. As regards the other works, I found the gangs were generally earning the full wage allowed by the Code. At the same time the condition of the people either on the works or in the villages was not such as to indicate the necessity for the immediate conversion of the test works into relief works. As I mentioned, the gangs are divided into three classes with different wages and work and the gangs are formed according to the work to be done. Recently we had a census report on wages. This census was held once in five years. In last year's report I find in the Bellary district the wages paid in cash to men who were sowers and transplanters were As. 2-11 in black-soil tracts and

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

As. 3 in red soil tracts and As. 3-8 in the Tungabhadra channel area. The area affected is mainly black cotton soil and that is why there is not much cultivation going on there now. If the labourers are paid in grain their wage is As. 2-1 in both black and red soil tracts. Women's wages are As. 2-2 and As. 2-1 in cash and As. 1-2 and As. 1-8 in grain. For reaping and harvesting, the cash wages are a little higher, being for men As. 3-2 in black soil and As. 3-5 in red soils. The cash wages for women are As. 2-5 in both soils. I am quoting these to show that the wages now paid on the test works are not very low. During the period of test we are justified in presuming that the people have some resources left; it is not desirable for the Government to take the place of the landlord or the ryot and relieve him of the duty of paying adequate wages by maintaining the labouring classes during the off-season. It is the custom of the country for the agricultural labourers to be paid such wages during the working season as will enable them to tide over the slack season. I can assure the House that we are watching the situation very carefully. The area is not far from the headquarters of the Bellary district and the Collector has easy access to the various works. The Government have displayed considerable sympathy towards this district in the last few years. The communiqué to which my hon. Friend referred will show that we have recently remitted 4½ lakhs of rupees of land revenue and suspended till next year the collection of 2½ lakhs of rupees. We have also been very generous in the matter of loans. I am asking for this grant to enable us to provide, till the next meeting of the Legislative Council, work for the labouring classes in the Bellary district on the present lines; if rains come we may be able to close the works. We have to bear in mind that we must neither make the labouring classes suffer nor waste Government money."

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

IX.—THE ORISSA COMMITTEE REPORT.

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

> '*that the Report of the Orissa Committee be taken into consideration.*' "

Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—" I rise to a point of order. It is said that the motion is made under rule 24-A. That rule I fear does not apply here. No reference has been made by the Government of India under section 52-A. This Council is not competent to consider the question. It is a central subject and this Council has nothing to do with it and it does not appear from the communications received that the Government of India has made any reference to the opinion of this Council."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Will the hon. Member point out whether the reference of the Government of India is necessary for a motion like this?"

[2nd August, 1932

Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"Section 52 says that the Government of India may after obtaining the expression of opinion of the Local Government and the local legislature affected, etc."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Mr. President, Sir, the point raised by the hon. Member for Ganjam is entirely beside the point. In respect of an act which the Governor-General in Council may be doing in order to constitute a new Governor's province that section operates. But in regard to placing the subject before the Legislative Council for elucidating its opinion upon some subject it is entirely for the Local Government to place it before the Council. If this motion is put under Rule 24-A it is only in regard to the precedence in the agenda. It does not affect the subject matter. It is with regard to the precedence; otherwise it should come like an ordinary motion. But in a Government motion it is left to the Government to choose the place in the agenda."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I do not think the hon. Member from Ganjam has properly appreciated the significance of Rule 24-A. Rule 24-A deals with the question of the power of the Legislative Council to discuss motions other than resolutions and certain other matters. Further this motion does not contain any reference to the Governor-General and it mainly places before the House the report of the Orissa Committee for consideration. I do not think therefore that any objection need be raised to get through the discussion of this motion."

Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"I raise another point of order. This Orissa Committee report relates not only to Madras areas but also areas outside Madras Presidency. This Council at any rate has no power to consider the whole report."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think the hon. Member is aware that as far as this Province is affected by the Report of the Orissa Committee, this House is entitled to discuss it and therefore the objection that he has raised is quite out of order."

At this stage the House rose for lunch.

After Lunch—(2-30 p.m.).

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"Mr. President, Sir, the question of forming a separate province for the Oriya races, so as to include in one province the people of the Oriya races who are scattered in different provinces at present, has been considered at various times since the beginning of this century. More recently, it was considered by the Statutory Commission and again at the Round Table Conference, and finally the consideration assumed a definite form by the appointment last September by the Government of India of a small committee *to examine and report on the financial and other consequences of setting up a separate administration for Orissa, and to make recommendations regarding the boundaries in the event of separation.* Volume I of the Report was published in April and Volume II has not yet reached this Government, and presumably has not been placed at the disposal of the public. It is however most desirable that the recommendations made in this Report should be dealt with as quickly as possible, for on the decision whether there is to be a separate province for Oriyas must

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

necessarily depend the strength of the Legislative Council in this province and in the other provinces affected, and also the distribution of membership among the various communities if the system of separate electorates is still maintained. We all know that the Government are most anxious to press forward with the measures necessary for the introduction of new Reforms, and it is essential all such matters should be settled with the least possible delay. The Government of India have in the ordinary course asked for our views on this Report, and have intimated that they would welcome a discussion in this Council and will be glad to be informed of the proceedings here. It seemed to me that the best way of bringing about a discussion in this House was to bring forward this motion. But, in doing so, I have not made any definite proposals, and I do not propose that the official Members should express any definite views as to what the decision should be, or that they should vote on one side or the other, should an occasion arise for voting in the House. Certain proposals will be made, I understand, by hon. Members, and it was my intention that such amendments should be moved on my present motion.

"I will briefly summarize the proposals which are made in the Report. The Committee considered the various areas in the provinces which might possibly be included in the new Orissa province, and recommended that the new province should include three districts of the present Orissa, namely, Cuttack, Puri and Balasore, and also the area known as Angul which consists of the Angul subdivision and the Khond Mahals. They also recommended the inclusion of Khariar Zamindari in the Central Provinces with an area of 1,500 square miles and a population of 160,000 which the Committee describes as an extremely backward area. The only other area now in the Central Provinces which according to the Committee's proposals will be included in the new province is the Padampur tract which consists of 61 villages. The rest of the new province will include portions of the Ganjam district and agency and of the Vizagapatam Agency. The whole of the new province will have an area of about 33,000 square miles, of which 18,000 or rather more than half is to be provided from the Madras Presidency. The total population in the new province will be about $8\frac{1}{4}$ millions, of which $2\frac{3}{4}$ millions, or one-third, will be provided from the Ganjam and Vizagapatam Agency including the Jeypore Zamindari.

"Now, we are mainly concerned to-day, as many hon. Members have already remarked, with those portions which are to be transferred from this Presidency. I was anxious to get a map prepared to illustrate the proposals of the Committee, but I have not been able to do so. The area proposed to be transferred from the Madras Presidency includes almost the whole of the Ganjam district except the area on the south-east of Berhampur; Berhampur is to be transferred to the new province; also the Parlakimedi Zamindari and a portion of the Vizagapatam Agency including the Jeypore Zamindari.

"In considering the proposals for the administration of the new province, the Committee seem to have done their best to devise a system which will be as economical as possible. The administration will be

[Sir Archibald Campbell] [2nd August 1932

in the hands of a Governor and two Ministers. The seat of Government will be at Cuttack. There will be two Secretaries to Government; one Revenue Commissioner, who will also be in charge of Forests, Excise, Registration, Land Records and Stamps; seven District Officers; two District Judges; a Development Commissioner in charge of the Agriculture, Veterinary, Co-operative and Industries departments; one Chief Engineer who will also be the Secretary to Government; an Inspector-General of Prisons and Civil Hospitals will also be the Director of Public Health; a Director of Public Instruction and an Inspector-General of Police. The number of superior officers is kept as small as possible. The All-India Service officers are to be borrowed from the neighbouring provinces; that will involve the disadvantage that they will not be acquainted with the Oriya language when first posted to the Province but they will no doubt soon acquaint themselves with it after they have been in office for some time.

"The financial position which the Committee arrived at is as follows: They estimate the basic revenue, as they call it, at 136·58 lakhs, and the basic expenditure at 152·50 lakhs. They add on to the latter the cost of the creation of the new administration, such as, the pay of the Governor, the Ministers and so on. The Committee has put the pay of the Governor and the Ministers as low as possible, but the extra cost involved is 18·23 lakhs. This makes the deficit in the first year one of 34·15 lakhs, or allowing for normal expansion of expenditure, the deficit will be 35·21 lakhs in the first year. The Committee anticipates that this deficit will rise in the course of fifteen years to 40·93 lakhs or practically 41 lakhs. They point out that the deficit cannot be met by the imposition of new taxes, but must be met by the allocation of new sources of revenue or by subventions from the Central Government, or by a combination of both these methods.

"Now, as I have already mentioned, the Committee has been as economical as possible in devising the form of administration, and with that end in view they propose that the new province should take advantage of various institutions in the neighbouring provinces. They are going to call upon various provinces for assistance in this direction. For instance, they will look to Nagpur and Cawnpore for agricultural training; they will look to Bengal for chemical examinations, for the inspection of boilers, for the training of assistant surgeons and so on; they will look to Bihar for a very considerable amount of assistance especially in such matters as the training of sanitary inspectors, public health laboratories, the school of mines, Police training colleges, the reformatory school, the mental hospital, the Indian schools of medicine and in particular they will look to Patna for its University and the Law College, the Medical College, the Veterinary College, the Engineering College and last but not the least for its High Court. It is proposed that the Judges of the Patna High Court should proceed from Patna on circuit to the new province, but the Judicial Officers who are to belong to the Bihar cadre will be called upon to administer the local laws of three different provinces.

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

"As regards the reasons for these proposals, I will refer hon. Members to paragraph 62 of the report from which it will be seen that it is admitted that the Madras Government has in the past dealt sympathetically with the difficulties of the Oriyas. That has always been admitted when this question has been under consideration. But none the less there is the desire amongst the Oriyas that they should come under one Provincial Government and should be not scattered about in different provinces.

"The Committee summarizes its conclusion as follows:—

'Nevertheless, the origin of the demand for re-union with Orissa is not to be found in any specific grievances against the present administration. The desire of the educated Oriyas of Ganjam to be included in a separate province of Orissa is genuine and strong; but it is inspired by the ties of race, language, and history, of which they have become increasingly conscious during the last thirty years.'

"My desire in making this motion, as I already said, is to give the members of this House an opportunity to express their views both on the general proposal that a new province should be formed and on the questions whether any area of this province should be transferred to this new province and, if so, what its boundaries should be. Members of the House will, no doubt, consider whether the conclusions which the Committee has drawn from the evidence before it have been correctly drawn, for example, as regards the classification of certain castes as Oriya or Telugu as the case may be, or as to whether Ganjam or Vizagapatam is historically more connected with Orissa than with this province. The House must also consider the proposed administrative arrangements and especially their effect on the portion of the Madras Presidency to be transferred to the new province. Another important question which the House will have to consider is the financial solvency of the new province and the effect of the proposed transfer of an area to the new province on the finances of this Presidency. Finally the House should consider whether in view of the admitted desire of the Oriyas for a separate province, a separate province should be formed in spite of the difficulties attendant on its formation and if so what area should be transferred from this Presidency. It is not desirable to discuss all these matters in too much detail, though I have to some extent summarized the details and endeavoured to give the members of the House a general outline, of the proposals of the committee."

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes:—"I second the motion."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"Mr. President, Sir, I rise to move the motion of which I have given notice, namely:

'*That the consideration of the Report of the Orissa Committee be adjourned to the next meeting of the Council and that in the meanwhile volumes II and III of the Report be made available to Members of this Council.*'

"Sir, I do not want to dilate much on this adjournment motion. The hon. the Revenue Member has merely stated in the motion which he has tabled that the Report be taken into consideration. I do not think that would be the proper form when we read the section of the Government of India Act, 52-A. It is clear that on such questions the

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [2nd August 1932

House should be asked to express a definite opinion on the matter and the motion should have been tabled in that form. Probably I should have raised the point much earlier, but all the same I think it is worth mentioning that the form through which the hon. Member seeks our opinion is not the proper form. We should have been asked to express our opinion and time should have been given to us to consider the report and also enable us to make up our minds as to what exactly should be our opinion on points which are so controversial as those contained in the Report. For one thing, Mr. President, I do not know how the hon. the Revenue Member will meet the point that he has not supplied to us copies of the report more than two days prior to the actual date of the meeting. For my part I received a copy of the report, volume I only, on Saturday noon, and even up to this date we have not been furnished with copies of the rest of the volumes. It might be said by some hon. Members of this House that volumes 2 and 3 are not material, but I beg to differ from any gentleman who holds any such view. In fact, references are made in volume I to volumes II and III. In the first place, I have not had the time even cursorily to go through the report, secondly references are made in volume I to facts and figures in volumes II and III. More than that, it is absolutely essential for the members of the House to express an opinion that they should read volume I in conjunction with volumes II and III. These volumes contain the recorded evidence of the Committee and also the written memoranda submitted to it by various persons interested in the question. Further, there are various references to maps, that seem to have been prepared by the Committee or at their instance; and the maps will exactly show where the territory lies which has to be transferred, and which territory it is that is in dispute, which part of the taluk or district that will go to make a new province and so on. Perhaps by a notification circulated to us this morning, two or three maps seem to have been hung in the Legislative Council Library. We were not aware when they were brought and placed at the library. We came to know of this only after coming to this House.

" Now, in the report, references have been made to blocks 2 and 3 in various places. It is not possible for us to find out which is block I or which is block A or which is block B. Two or three maps placed in the library without any previous notice cannot enable us to give any intelligent expression to our opinion, on such an important question like this.

" Then again, Sir, I submit that on a question like this, it was not enough that the Report should have been published in the newspapers. Members could not be expected to read the newspaper and come prepared to express their opinion merely on such reading. If at least the hon. the Revenue Member had the courtesy to intimate to us through the Legislative Council office that he was going to make a motion within 15 or 20 clear days, then we could have written to the Secretary for copies of the Report and they could have been made available to us earlier than has been actually done. The notice itself came from the office of the Legislative Council very late, and we had no opportunity

2nd August 1932] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

to go through the Report and the other volumes of the Report which have not yet been placed either in the library or in the possession of the members of the House. I do not want to go into the merits of the question, because I am merely moving a motion for adjournment. There are certain friends of mine in this House who think that in requesting the House to defer consideration of the Report I am putting a spoke in the wheel of an Oriya province being formed and that the Andhras are going to lose the advantage which they are now trying to get in the shape of retaining certain taluks of certain districts proposed to be transferred to the new province of Orissa. Now, Sir, the bone of contention between the two parties, the Oriyas and the Andhras, seems to be concentrated on certain tracts of the Madras Presidency. The point as to whether that contention was tenable or not, the amendment that is on the table of the House, namely, the amendment given notice of by the Raja of Bobbili, definitely makes clear as to what exactly is aimed at by that amendment. It goes far beyond what has been recommended by the Committee itself. That being the case, it is necessary that we should wait for the other two volumes of the Report not yet published and also must have time to study the maps referred to therein. On these grounds I would urge on the House to defer consideration of the Report. After all, the delay of a month or two is not going to matter much, and I do not think any great loss will be sustained by any of the parties concerned. Two months' time is nothing when we consider that this agitation has been going on since the year 1901, and in spite of efforts made by the Government time and again, this question has not been settled. Two months' delay will not matter much, and within that time, we shall be able to form a definite opinion as to what exactly are the respective claims and how far each party is justified in trying to get what they think is their due. For these reasons, I urge on the House to support my motion."

* Mr. V. T. Arasu:—"Mr. President, I have great pleasure in seconding the motion of my hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed. We received the Report, not on Saturday as pointed out by Mr. Basheer Ahmed, but on Sunday morning. Therefore we have had no time whatever to read the Report and come to any sort of conclusion. There is another reason why the consideration of the subject should be postponed. As would be remembered by the hon. Members of this House, the hon. Member for Ganjam, the Raja of Parlakimedi, was responsible for suggesting the formation of a new Oriya province. It was at his instance, and as a result of his speech at the Round Table Conference, that His Majesty's Government have constituted a committee to go into the question. Unfortunately, the Raja Sahib is not here to-day to give his opinion on account, I understand, of the death of his mother. There is also another reason why this House should wait until the Raja Sahib is able to be present here to express his views on this question. In the Report of the O'Donnell Committee, there are some allegations made against the Raja Sahib. The allegations are that the Raja Sahib has brought undue influence to bear on some of the witnesses who gave evidence before that Committee. I am

[Mr. V. T. Arasu] [2nd August 1932

therefore of opinion that it is but fair and proper that this House should hear the Raja of Parlakimedi on this important question. For these reasons I strongly support the motion made by my Friend Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed."

m. * The Raja of Kallikote:—" Sir, I rise to support the motion so ably moved and seconded by the hon. Members of the Opposition. Volume II of the Report which contains several particulars including maps showing the population of the different areas and other information that will be useful is not yet before us. Of course volume III containing the evidence, according to orders of the Government of India, will not be published and so we are only concerned with volumes I and II. Even volume I came into my hands only a week ago and other hon. Members only got it on Saturday. Because I am particularly interested I managed to get this earlier. Nobody has had the time to study it and come to definite conclusions. From the correspondence I am having with a Calcutta firm I am told that the second volume is not yet printed.

" Apart from these considerations the absence of the Raja Sahib of Parlakimedi is a great handicap to us. There seems to be the biggest controversy as to whether the Parlakimedi Estate should or should not be included in the proposed province. Several statements have been made in favour and against the proposal and even allegations have been made against the Raja Sahib. It is therefore fair and reasonable that he should be given a chance to put forward his case. Besides, the Raja Sahib moved this question at the Round Table Conference and he was also an Associate Member of the Committee whose Report is before us. He realizes the importance of the situation and would have certainly been here to-day, but unfortunately owing to certain recent domestic calamities he has been deprived of this opportunity. This seems to be an additional ground in support of the motion and in view of the fact that the material before us is defective for want of the second volume, I would appeal to the House and the hon. Members of Government not to press for the motion but to agree to adjourn the consideration until the next meeting of the Council."

* The Raja of Bobbili:—" Sir, in rising to oppose the motion before the House I wish to say that every one is aware that this question has been engaging the public attention very seriously ever since the Committee was formed and especially more so ever since the Report was published.

" I find, especially since the Report was published, that this question has been seriously agitating the minds of the public of both the provinces. I also feel that not only in the interests of the public but also in the interests of every one concerned, it is desirable that this question should be decided as early as possible. I am no doubt sorry that the Raja Sahib of Parlakimedi is unable to attend the present session and present his case to-day. If it had been possible to give such an opportunity to him in the remaining few days of this Council,

2nd August 1932] [The Raja of Bobbili]

I would have never opposed this motion for adjournment. As I understand, the position is that the Council may be called into being in October or November. By that time I presume the Government of India will have formulated their proposals and sent them both to the Consultative Committee and to the Home Government. It is the special privilege of this House that it should express its opinion before final proposals for the formation of a new Oriya province are made. There are areas in the Oriya province which are bound up by ties of race, religion and language with the territories in this Province for many centuries and it is now proposed in this Report to cut them away from the rest of the Province. Having had the honour of representing Vizagapatam district including the Agency tracts, it is my duty to place before this House the strong feelings of the people of those districts if the Committee's proposals for the formation of a Oriya province are carried into effect. But I do not propose to speak on the merits of the report on the adjournment motion now before the House. My submission to the House is that as there is no other opportunity for this House to express its opinion on this report and as the fate of several millions of people of this Province is going to be decided before very long, it is necessary that both the Consultative Committee and the Government should have the valuable opinion of this House before them. It is therefore necessary that this House should express its opinion on the motion moved by the hon. the Revenue Member now. With these few words I strongly oppose the motion."

* Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI:—"Mr. President, although indisposed still, yet I am constrained to intervene in this debate on account of the importance of the matter. Having received Volume I of the Report only a couple of days back, and having had no time to study it or do full justice to it, we cannot be expected to express our opinion on this important matter in a proper manner. In fact, many of us only had a cursory glance of the Report. Fain would I therefore support the motion of my hon. Friend Mr. Basheer Ahmed for the postponement of the consideration of this matter until the next meeting, but my difficulty is: when is the next meeeting to come off? Somebody said it would be in September, another in October, a third in November, and a fourth in January. I am afraid we shall have to wait till Greek Kalends. That is why I am obliged to oppose my Friend's motion. I do not mean in any way to discourage my Oriya brethren in their attempt to have their own Province. On the other hand I wish them good luck. With all the revenue they could scrape from that arid land, I am afraid they will be put to an initial additional expenditure of over Rs. 50 lakhs which the Imperial Government or the Federal Government or the Central Government—call it whatever you like—will be obliged to shell out, if the proposal to create a Oriya province were to become a *fait accompli*. Again not only initial expenditure, but also a large recurring expenditure they will have to bear. It may be said that I am just entering on the merits of the case but my submission is that certainly we Andhras, all of us, here and elsewhere, would be very happy if our Oriya brethren had a Province

of their own, because we had been fighting for the last two decades for an Andhra province. Our difficulty is that instead of getting a province for ourselves we are being dismembered. According to the recommendation of the majority Report a large slice of the Telugu country is proposed to be tacked on to the Orissa province."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" The hon. Member will confine his remarks to the motion under discussion."

Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI:—" If the hon. the Revenue Member assures us that he will give us an early opportunity for discussing this important matter, I shall have no objection to support the motion of my hon. Friend Mr. Basheer Ahmed. Otherwise it must be proceeded with now."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—" I also oppose this adjournment motion. At first sight one would naturally wish that this motion should be supported. I quite realize that the Report was distributed very late and probably when the second and third volumes are available we will be in a better position to come to definite conclusions. But our real difficulty is whether our opinion is going to have any value at all. I am afraid unless we express our opinion on the Report now, it is not likely that our opinion will be considered at all at any future time. If the hon. the Revenue Member assures us that a chance will be given to us, say that we will have an opportunity of expressing our opinion in a month or so, then we can support this motion. But if there is no certainty of the Council meeting in the near future, then our opinion expressed at any distant future will not have any value, because by the time the rest of the Report is printed and published the Government of India will have made their proposals. The strength of feeling among the Telugu-speaking population is very strong and they are of opinion that the recommendations of the Orissa Committee ought not to be given effect to, and that the considered opinion of this House should be sent in time to the Government of India. But for this reason I would certainly not have opposed this motion. Most of us are anxious that this question should be settled. Although the Report is big, the pages that concern Madras are very few and most of the pages are occupied by financial statistics. Most of the pages concern other Provinces. So it will not be difficult for us to come to conclusions on this report."

* Mr. A. V. BHANOJI RAO:—" I rise to oppose this motion, because the reason given by my hon. Friend Mr. Basheer Ahmed is not at all convincing. He said that the first volume came to his hand only on Saturday. I am sure that the hon. Mover knows that this controversy had been going on for the last six months or one year and all people know that Oriyas are preparing their case. I may tell for the information of the House when Mr. Patnaik and myself were travelling in the same train, and when I asked him as to what the various books and papers which he had were he replied they were all about the Oriya question. So he cannot say that people are not prepared to express their opinion on this matter now.

2nd August 1932] [Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao]

" The second volume contains nothing but the evidence. As regards the maps they were hung up yesterday in the Council Library and if hon. Members had taken a little interest they would have known that they relate to the motion that would come before the House to-day. The reasons advanced by several hon. Members in support of the motion for adjournment are not convincing. I am afraid that unless this Council expresses its opinion on the question now, the Government of Madras will be put in a very delicate position when they have to report to the Government of India on this subject, and further new constitutions will be introduced for the various provinces very shortly. Unless the Government of India have the definite opinion of this Council on this subject, they will not be able to prepare a scheme for the formation of various linguistic provinces. I am afraid if this subject is not considered now, it cannot come up before the House for some time more and the case may go by default for not having expressed our opinion in time. Under these circumstances, as both the Andhras and the Oriyas are prepared and have come down here, fully prepared, I think the motion for adjournment must be opposed very strongly."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Mr. President, Sir, while opposing the motion for adjournment one or two hon. Members said that the case may go by default. I am afraid they are not aware of the fact that the Government of India have not asked this Government to elicit the opinion of this Council on the question of the formation of an Oriya province. Under section 52-A of the Government of India Act, it is incumbent on the Government of India to consult this House before they can constitute any new Governor's or Lieutenant Governor's province. Therefore those who apprehend that the case may go by default do not know that the motion now put forward by the Madras Government is not done at the instance of the Government of India.

" The next question is when the next meeting of the Council will be held. I suggest that if the Government of India asks for the opinion of this Council, the Government of Madras will arrange for an early meeting of this House to enable it to express an opinion on the subject. Therefore the case will not go by default if we do not express our opinion now. Moreover, we have not had sufficient time to thoroughly consider the pros and cons of the question as the Report was put into our hands only recently. It is a very important question and therefore I think it is better that the discussion is postponed. It was said that hon. Members who will be affected by the formation of this province are already aware of the facts. But I should like to point out to them that it is not only the opinion of the Oriya or the Andhra members that are affected by this question but the opinion of the Council as a whole. The whole Presidency will be affected if you take away a district here and a district there. For these reasons, I support the motion for adjournment."

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo :—" Mr. President, Sir, it is admitted on all hands that members are not fully prepared to consider the question at present. I am also not prepared to do full justice to

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo] [2nd August 1932

the subject. Even the hon. the Revenue Member said that for want of time he could not prepare the map showing the tracts proposed to be transferred. (Interruption.) I heard you say like that. If that is so everybody is not prepared. Of course one gentleman said—he spoke not only on behalf of the Andhras but also on behalf of the Oriyas though he is only an Andhra—that the rival parties were thoroughly prepared to deal with the question now. I do not know where he got this information from. If I had the opportunity I should like to cross-examine him and show that he has not studied this subject well. Unfortunately I cannot do it. The only ground on which the Andhras want this question to be rushed through in this House now is that the Government of India without consulting the Madras Government and the Madras Council may recommend a scheme to the Secretary of State, get his approval and notify the creation of a new Oriya province. I am afraid they are drawing too much upon their imagination to say so. I am certain that the Government of India will realize their responsibility and call upon this Government and this Council to express their opinions knowing full well that this Government have always been unsympathetically opposed to the transfer of these tracts to a new Oriya province."

Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi:—" On a point of order, Mr. President, are we now discussing the question of the transfer of these tracts? "

Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo:—" I know I am quite in order. Reference was made to this question before by several hon. Members and by the hon. Member who raises this point of order.

" As has been pointed out, this Council has got the right, except under section 52-A, to express its opinion on the question before it is finally decided. Therefore nothing will be lost if the consideration of this subject is postponed.

" Moreover the Oriyas are in a hopeless minority in this House whereas the Andhras are in a very powerful position as is seen from the way in which they are represented in the House and in the various offices held by them. If this motion is lost it will show the tyranny of the majority over a helpless minority. If the Andhras have any sense of fairplay I think they will agree to this adjournment motion and urge upon the Government to have the next meeting of the Council as early as possible to enable us to express a well considered opinion on the subject. Of course, if they wish to rush through they can easily do it, but that would be mere tyranny."

* The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—" Sir, I do not wish to take up the time of the House in meeting the several arguments advanced either for or against the adjournment motion. But I should like to associate myself with my hon. Friend the Raja of Bobbili in regretting the absence of the Raja of Parlakimedi. But his views are well-known to members of the House. This matter is not certainly sprung on us. It has been under consideration for some years and we all know that it has been coming forward in an acute form at the present time. As

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

a matter of fact the appointment of this Committee was sufficient to show that an early decision was going to be taken on this subject. I am quite sure everyone interested in this question has been preparing arguments either in favour or against the transfer of certain parts of this Presidency to a new Oriya province. As regards the remarks of the last speaker, I am not sure how an adjournment will lessen the 'tyranny' as my hon. Friend expresses it, of the Andhras at a later date. I hope this debate will not develop into an acute racial dispute as foreshadowed by the remarks of the last speaker. I am quite sure that everyone in this House will deal with this question on broad considerations and not from personal considerations arising from his belonging to one race or another race. In any case there are besides the Andhras and the Oriyas a number of other hon. Members who can be trusted to arrive at a fair decision on the facts placed before them. I trust hon. Members will take such advantage as they can of the opportunity which I have given them to place their views before the Government and therefore before the Government of India and presumably before the Consultative Committee as well. It is most desirable that the House should take advantage of this opportunity to express their views now, as the next meeting of the Council is not likely to be held before November."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that the consideration of the Report of the Orissa Committee be adjourned to the next meeting of the Council and that in the meanwhile Volumes II and III of the Report be made available to the Members of the Council."

The question was put and declared lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:— 3 P

Ayes.

1. Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
2. ,, K. P. Raman Menon.
3. ,, P. Bayappa Reddi.
4. ,, T. Narasa Reddi.
5. Raja of Kallikote.
6. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.
7. Dr. P. Subbarayan.
8. Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.
9. Rao Bahadur T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
10. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur.
11. Mr. A. B. Shetty.
12. ,, Abdul Hameed Khan.
13. ,, Basheer Ahmed Sayeed.
14. ,, Ahmed Miran.
15. ,, K. Nachiyappa Gounder.
16. ,, A. Pl. N. V. Nadimuthu Pillai.
17. ,, K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.
18. ,, V. T. Arasu.
19. S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.

Noes.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur.
2. ,, Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishan Nayar.
3. ,, Sir Archibald Campbell.
4. ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
5. ,, Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
6. The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan.
7. ,, Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
8. Rao Bahadur G. Jagannatha Raju.
9. Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
10. Mr. C. E. Jones.
11. ,, J. A. Thorne.
12. ,, H. M. Hood.
13. ,, R. Madanagopal Nayudu.

[2nd August 1932

Noes—cont.

14. Mr. S. H. Slater.
15. ,, E. Conran Smith.
16. ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
17. Khan Sahib Syed Tajudin Sahib Bahadur.
18. Mr. M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
19. ,, K. C. M. Venkatachala Reddiyar.
20. ,, G. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
21. ,, M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.
22. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
23. Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
24. Mr. M. S. Sreshta.
25. ,, P. C. Moses.
26. ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
27. ,, C. Indrayya.
28. Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
29. Raja of Bobbili.
30. Kumararaja of Venkatagiri.
31. Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
32. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
33. ,, A. V. Bhanoji Rao.
34. ,, J. A. Davis.
35. ,, Daniel Thomas.
36. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
37. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanya Chetti.
38. Zamindar of Kirlampudi.
39. Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu.
40. Zamindar of Chemudu.
41. Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami.
42. Mr. A. Harischandrudu.
43. ,, K. Kesavaramamurti.
44. ,, Mahboob Ali Baig.
45. ,, Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
46. ,, M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
47. ,, A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
48. ,, K. Koti Reddi.
49. ,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
50. ,, F. G. Luker.
51. ,, A. W. Hutton.
52. ,, R. Foulkes.
53. ,, F. J. Stanes.
54. ,, F. E. James.
55. Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi.
56. Mr. J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
57. ,, C. Satyanarayana Choudari.
58. ,, C. Basu Dev.
59. Rao Sahib D. Krishnamurti.
60. Mr. A. Ramakrishna Reddi.
61. Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur.
62. Mr. G. Sriramulu.
63. ,, H. M. Jagannatham.
64. Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan.
65. Mr. G. R. Premayya.
66. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
67. Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
68. Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi.
69. ,, C. Krishnan.
70. ,, P. Peddiraju.

Neutral.

1. Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
2. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
3. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
4. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
5. Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar.
6. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.

Ayes 19. *Noes* 70. *Neutral* 6.

The motion was lost.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Before proceeding with the further consideration of this motion, I wish to inform the House of the procedure that I propose to adopt. There are two ways of dealing with such a motion. Firstly, it may be dealt with on the analogy of a Bill where, after the motion for consideration is passed, individual amendments are taken up, discussed and voted upon. Secondly, as has been done on a previous occasion with reference to a similar kind of motion, the main motion and the amendments may be discussed together though voted upon separately. The latter procedure may entail repetition of ideas, the overlapping of arguments and much loss of time. The vote now recorded by the House on the motion of Mr. Basheer Ahmed indicates the sense of the House with regard to the main motion. If it is to the convenience of the House and if no serious objection is taken, I would adopt the former course and put the main motion to the vote of the House first. After that is carried the House may discuss the amendments which raise important issues and vote upon them.

(Voices: ' No objection '.)

2nd August 1932] [The President]

"No objection being taken, I shall put the main motion to the vote of the House.

"The motion is

"*that the Report of the Orissa Committee be taken into consideration*'."

The motion was carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"We have got on the agenda two amendments—one given notice of by the Raja of Bobbili and the other by Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. The first portion of the amendment of Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar covers the same ground as the amendment given notice of by the Raja of Bobbili, but the latter is a more comprehensive one. So I would call upon the Raja of Bobbili to move his amendment and later on would allow Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar to move the second portion of his amendment. The House will vote upon the amendments separately."

* The RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, with your permission, I move the following amendment:—

'*Add* the following at the end:—

"*and on such consideration this Council strongly opposes and emphatically protests against the recommendations of the Orissa Committee in so far as it favours the transfer of any portion of the Vizagapatam district and of any portion of the Ganjam district south of the Rushikulya river, its tributary, Godahado river and the Mohini hills and the transfer of any areas in which aboriginal tribes are in the majority, and this Council is further of opinion that this province should not be called upon to pay any subsidy either directly or indirectly on account of the transfer of any area from this province to the new Oriya province and urges upon this Government to convey this opinion to the Government of India with their own recommendation to the same effect*".'

"While doing so, I wish to make it quite clear that we do not stand in the way of the legitimate aspirations of the Oriyas for the formation of a province for them who are bound by common ties. I certainly sympathize with those aspirations of the Oriyas. I think the important grounds on which the separation of the province is urged are (1) to bring together the Oriyas who are now scattered in the various provinces, and (2) to eliminate the minorities problem. My primary objection to the report is that, by seeking to eliminate the minorities problem, you are creating a new minority problem in the case of the Andhras. It may be said in reply that adequate safeguards will be devised, and that there would be special representation, etc. But I am afraid, these are after all of doubtful utility. Those, Andhras, living in Vizagapatam and Ganjam districts—and who are going to become a minority—strongly object to the separation from the rest of the Andhras with whom they have been associated for many centuries.

[The Raja of Bobbili] [2nd August 1932

" Apart from the claims of the Andhras in these areas, I wish to place before this House the case of the aboriginal tribes who are almost voiceless and unable to effectively place their case before the public. Of course, it is a well-known fact that these people mostly inhabit the backward tracts known as the Agency and I think the Madras Government is spending three to four times the revenue derived, on this area. The test which the Report applies is one of race. I believe the Committee have erred when they said that there is racial affinity between the aboriginal tribes of Jeypore and the Oriyas in the Orissa province. I believe that the aboriginal tribes in Jeypore migrated to that part of the country really from the Central Provinces. It cannot be said that, simply because they speak the Oriya language, they are Oriyas by race.

3-45 p.m. " In deciding whether an area predominantly inhabited by the aboriginal tribes should be transferred or retained, I wish to impress on hon. Members of this House that they should first consider the interests of the tribes themselves, and not the interests of either the Andhras or the Oriyas. When you find what the Madras Government has been able to do to develop the Agency tracts, to provide facilities for the improvement of the economic condition of these aborigines, you are really unable to concede even a single point in favour of the transfer of these areas to a province, which even according to the Report itself is not likely to be self-supporting. My personal opinion however is that the figures mentioned in the Report about the establishment of the Secretariat will not be sufficient for carrying on the management of the new province; and I am sure it will be ultimately found necessary to increase the establishment; and in that way, the deficit will be much more than 45 lakhs. The question is: are we now going to transfer these tracts to the new province and thus deprive them of all the benefits and advantages that they now enjoy?

" Another difficulty that I foresee is the risk of providing Police facilities. We are not having sufficient Police force in these parts; a force is at present maintained at Vizagapatam. In times of trouble, it is very easy to convey the Police force to these areas. If the Jeypore zamindari is transferred to the new province, the Government of that province would be compelled to maintain a large force in a very unhealthy locality like Koraput and it will be really out of touch with the Inspector-General of Police. That is one reason. I have already stated that the proposal recommended will not be in the interests of the aboriginal tribes.

" As regards Parlakimedi, I feel that the very reasons given in the Report show that Parlakimedi does not fulfil any of the conditions laid down for its inclusion in the new province and separation from Madras. I need not therefore pursue that matter further.

" As regards the other areas, I do not see any justification for transferring those areas against the will of the population. I have

2nd August 1932] [The Raja of Bobbili]

stated in my amendment that 'all areas north of the Rushikulya river' alone should be included in the new province. The rest of the district should remain with Madras.

"Sir, I have not very much more to say. I only wish to stress this point: that by creating this new province and including the Agency therein, a claim might be made later on, on the finances of Madras; simply because Madras has been spending more than Rs. 30 lakhs on these areas over and above the income derived from them, it might be said that Madras should contribute that amount towards the finances of the new province, to cover up the deficit. The purpose of my amendment is to make that point quite clear, that no such claim should be made on this province.

"With these words, Sir, I wish to recommend to the House my amendment."

The KUMARA RAJA OF VENKATAGIRI seconded the motion.

* Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON:—"May I ask the hon. Member who moved the amendment to split it into three portions? If that is done, we can easily follow his argument with reference to the last portion of his argument at least. For example, I completely sympathize with the hon. Member when he says that this Presidency should not be called upon to subsidize the new province when it comes into being. But before I speak further on the other matters referred to in the amendment, such as racial distribution, the affinity of the aboriginal tribes, etc., I wish to know if the hon. Member would split his motion into three portions. The proposition naturally divides itself into three parts. First of all, there is the dismemberment. If I may so call it—of the Ganjam and Vizagapatam districts. Then comes the question of the aboriginal tribes—whether they are to be relegated to the new province or to be retained in the Madras province itself. I do not know how they are to be distributed between the two provinces. Thirdly, Sir, comes the subsidy question on which perhaps almost every one is agreed that we shall not be called upon to contribute anything to the new province. May I therefore call upon the proposer of the amendment to split it into three parts, so that it may be easier for us to follow the debate and to make up our minds with reference to each part of the proposition moved by him?"

* The RAJA OF KALLIKOTE:—"Mr. President, Sir, I rise to oppose the motion moved by my hon. Friend, the Raja Sahib of Bobbili. While thanking the Opposition for the little support they have given us, the result of the modest proposal made by us that this question be deferred until the next meeting of the Council clearly shows how helpless a minority the Oriyas are, not only in this Council, but in this province. I am afraid a debate on any motion regarding this subject is bound to be one-sided in this House. Including the hon. Member that is absent, there are three Oriyas in this House in a total strength of 132 and, Sir, you can well imagine what support the matter will receive. It is most unfortunate that this debate should have been

[The Raja of Kallikote] [2nd August 1932

introduced in this House. The Oriyas would welcome a debate in the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State and an impartial decision by the Government of India. It is a well-known fact that this Government is against the proposal of any portion of Ganjam going into the Oriya province and I dare say the claims of Oriyas before the House will receive the same fate. I, for one, will not press for a division, as I am confident that the quicker this Council disposes of this question, the stronger will be the case of the Oriyas before the Central Government and the other authorities.

4 p.m. "Mr. President, the Oriyas are in the unfortunate position of being in a helpless minority in four provinces now and there is no salvation for the community until it is brought under one administration. This agitation for the unification of the Oriya-speaking tracts under one province is more than 40 years' old and in spite of severe attacks it still exists and will exist until the problem is solved. Although I know the difficulties the Oriyas are suffering in the other provinces, I do not wish to describe them here, but only wish to describe a few grievances the Oriyas of this Presidency have. To begin with, we are in a helpless minority in this Council and, as Oriyas, we can achieve nothing. The Oriyas are not adequately represented in the Public Services and the little protection we had from the Government has completely disappeared after the constitution of the Public Services Commission. By way of illustration I might quote how even ordinary clerical posts in purely Oriya tracts of the Ganjam district are being filled up by persons from Trichinopoly and Tanjore when there are hundreds of qualified Oriyas in the district starving and unemployed. There are not enough educational facilities for the community and Madras University is about 700 miles away and it is not giving any instructions in Oriya. I have personal experience of this as a student of the Madras University and the Andhra University, although not so far, does not make adequate provision for the teaching of Oriya. Oriya culture and literature is losing its identity and the Oriya students are compelled to go to Cuttack and other places in the Bihar and Orissa province where better attention is paid to the teaching of Oriya; but unfortunately after they come back fully qualified the rules of the Madras Government do not give them a chance to secure any competitive posts. The result is they are discontented and are greatly adding to the list of unemployment in the Ganjam district. We have to come 700 miles to the Madras High Court for litigation whereas we will be within about hundred miles if the proposed province is given as it is intended to continue the same system of circuit judges visiting Cuttack to do the High Court work. There is no doubt that there is a genuine desire on the part of the educated Oriyas to be included in a separate province of Orissa and this desire is inspired not only through the difficulties that I have just described but through ties of history, language, race and relationship, that exist between the Oriyas of Ganjam and Oriyas of existing Orissa.

"I am sorry that there has been all this excitement on the part of the Andhras regarding the proposed Oriya Province. On the other

2nd August 1932] [The Raja of Kallikote]

hand the proposed province will give a stimulus to the Andhras to carry on their own agitation for a Andhra Province and whether a few miles of territory should be included in the Oriya Province or not should not worry them so much when once they concede to the principle that there should be a redistribution of provinces on linguistic and racial basis. A statement has been made quite recently that Berhampur owes all its culture, learning and civilization to the Telugus; but the fact that there is a college there presented by my late lamented father is carefully and conveniently forgotten. Without this college there would not have been the culture and learning which the Andhras profess they have endowed Berhampur with. The Telugus of Berhampur and Chatrapur are not residents of the land, but have migrated there from the southern districts in search of Government employment and other professions. I know of several families who have come from the south, especially from the Vizagapatam district and settled down in Berhampur and several places of the Ganjam district where luck has favoured them due to the fact that the Oriyas were not educated and were very backward at that time. I have travelled quite enough in the Ganjam Agency and I have noticed at several places that I visited that Oriya is the second language used by these aborigines. It is unfortunate that the report of the Orissa Committee while recommending the inclusion of Parlakimedi Estate and the Jeypore Agency is excluding a strip of the coast including the Estates of Mandasa, Tekkali and Tarla. These estates have as strong a claim to be included in the Oriya Province as the Parlakimedi Estate has. Whatever may be the difference of opinion regarding the boundary, we cannot deny the fact that we have to face actual realities and that is the huge deficit that has been pointed out in the Report. As far as the Ganjam district is concerned, I am definitely against any further taxation and I cannot see what further new source of revenue can be tapped. We have to investigate thoroughly the conditions prevailing in the other parts that are recommended to be included in the new province and see how far taxation on new sources is possible. The expenditure has also to be further examined to see if it can be curtailed further. All this, I submit, can be done effectively by appointing a committee of officials and non-officials from the area that is proposed to be included in the new province to see how far further resources can be tapped and how far expenditure can be reduced. If this is not possible the only other alternative is for the Government of India to come forward with a subvention and thereby satisfy about ten millions of the Oriya population whose grievances are genuine and old. In spite of the opposition that this proposal may receive in this Council if the Oriyas are fortunate enough to get their province I wish to assure you, Sir, that it will be an ideal homogeneous little province where there will be no Brahman and non-Brahman feeling, no Hindu and Moslem differences, and communal troubles, from which other provinces have been suffering. The proposed province will cause no administrative inconvenience to the Madras Government. On the other hand, the separation would save

this Government a sum of rupees seventeen and odd lakhs. As a measure of retrenchment this should appeal to the hon. the Finance Member. If I was still a member of the Retrenchment Committee, I would press this aspect of the question before the hon. the Finance Member.

"With these few words, Mr. President, I wish to endorse the Majority Report of the Orissa Committee and to add that the Estates of Mandasa, Tekkali and Tarla should be included in the proposed province."

* Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari:—"Mr. President, Sir, with great pleasure, I rise to support the motion so ably made by the Raja Sahib of Bobbili. The Report before this House consists of two parts; one part dealing with the question of the formation of a separate province for the Oriya-speaking tracts and the other part dealing with the question of the particular areas which ought to be included in the proposed province. Both the recommendations made by the Committee in this report are disappointing and discouraging. The question of the formation of a new province for a particular area or for a particular people is always inseparably bound up with the question of finance. When we deal with the question of the formation of a new province, the first and foremost thing that we ought to consider is the financial implications involved in the proposal! What does the proposed new province cost? What does the administration of the province cost? What are the revenues of the province? What is the expenditure that is likely to be incurred for the administration of the new province? Is there going to be a deficit, and if there should be a deficit, are the people of the new province prepared to tax themselves or make up the deficit somehow or other? These are the points that ought to be borne in mind in dealing with a question of this kind. In fact, that is the principle laid down by the Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference which was appointed to consider the question of the formation of a new province for Sind. Now, applying this test, where do we stand? If we look into the Report, I should say, that the Report stands self-condemned in this matter. The Report states that the province which it proposes to form has to start with a deficit of 35 lakhs in the first year and in the course of 15 years, the deficit will grow to 41 lakhs. And, how is this deficit to be made good. That is a question that ought to be pertinently raised. This question was answered by the Raja Sahib of Parlakimedi. I am sorry to find he is not here to-day. The answer that he gave before the Round Table Conference was that the people are prepared to tax themselves. That is the reply, Sir, which the Raja Sahib made before the Round Table Conference at a time when he had no idea of what the deficit was going to be. Now, if this deficit is to be made good at all, it can be made good only by an enhancement of taxes by 30 per cent. I ask, Sir, are the people prepared to tax themselves by 30 per cent more. The Raja Sahib has given an undertaking on behalf of the people that they are prepared to do that. When I read his reply, I was reminded of the man of the Tamil proverb who goes along a street, sees a Pillayar koil and a coconut shop, lays his hands

2nd August 1932] [Mr. C Satyanarayana Choudari]

upon the coconut in the shop, breaks it in order to satisfy the deity and goes away without paying the owner of the coconut. The Raja Sahib has nothing to lose by the undertaking that he has given. Is he authorized or is he competent to speak on behalf of the people? As we know, the people of the areas which are sought to be included in the new province are already poorer than the people of the other parts of the Presidency. Thirty per cent enhancement in the taxes is bad enough, nay, may I say it is frightful even for a normally well-off province; it would be oppressive—Sir, nay, unbearable—in the case of the people on whose behalf the Raja Sahib spoke before the Round Table Conference.

"Well, Sir, the other remedy suggested by the report to get over this question of financial difficulty is that the Government of India might be asked to contribute out of the Central or Federal revenues. Here again, the Committee has gone wrong. It is a well-known fact that the Government of India has made it very clear that under no circumstances, would they accept any liability on the Central revenues. The Government of India, as it is, has to contribute about a crore of rupees to maintain the new North-West Frontier Province and if a separate province should be formed for Sind, another half a crore of rupees will have to be contributed out of the Federal or Central revenues. Wherefrom, then, will the Government of India be expected to get these 30 or 40 lakhs which the Oriya province may require to make good the deficit?

"Then, Sir, assuming that the Government of India is going to agree to the proposal to contribute 30 or 40 lakhs every year, yet the Government of India is not going to be a free agency in the matter under the new constitution, as we expect to have provincial autonomy for every province, when the provinces will have as much independence as possible and the voices of the provinces will have to be taken into consideration. The various provinces may complain or may resist the claim for contribution and justly too, because there is absolutely no justification why the general tax-payer ought to be expected to pay just to satisfy the sentiments of the Oriyas in their anxiety to have a separate province. If we look into Percy Report, i.e., the Federal Finance Committee, we see that under the new constitution six out of eight provinces will have to face staggering deficits year after year.

"Sir, having indicated the financial difficulties implied in the recommendation of the Committee for the formation of a separate province, I must at once say, at the same time, that I am not opposed to the principle of forming provinces on a linguistic basis. In fact, Sir, there is no responsible Andhra who is opposed to the principle underlying the demand of the Oriyas for a province for themselves. If my Oriya friends want to have a province for them and if they think that they can meet the expenditure involved in having a new province for themselves without the financial difficulties coming in the way, by all means, let them have it; I will be the first man to bless them and wish them every success.

[Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari] [2nd August 1932

" Having indicated the financial difficulties so far as the formation of a new province is concerned, I will go to the second part of the report which deals with the question of the areas that have got to be included in the proposed new province. With the exception of one or two small tracts, the report recommends the inclusion of the whole of the Vizagapatam Agency tracts. Sir, this is a recommendation which is opposed to the view of the Government of Madras. The Government of Madras has had occasion to express its attitude on this matter on more than one occasion between now and 1902.

4-15 p.m. " Time and again the Government of Madras have made it clear that the Agency tract cannot be transferred to the new province. In fact, the sub-committee appointed by the Statutory Commission which is popularly known as the Simon Commission, has also made a similar recommendation, namely, that the Vizagapatam Agency tract cannot, under any circumstances, be transferred to the new province. I think there are valid reasons to support this recommendation. The Agency tract consists not only of Oriyas, not only of Telugus; there are wild tracts inhabited by aboriginal tribes like the Khonds, Savaras and Koyas. These are tribes who are very much uncivilized, who require to be reclaimed, which means money. The Government of Madras have been very charitable towards these tribes. They have been spending year after year several lakhs to improve their civilization and their material condition. Now to assign these tribes, or rather, to send them along with the Oriyas, when the Oriyas are going to start with a deficit budget in the first year is really cruel.

" Apart from the question of aboriginal tribes residing in the Agency tracts, what is the condition of the Oriyas themselves? The Oriyas residing in the Vizagapatam Agency tracts are far less civilized and far less advanced than their Oriya brethren in the Orissa province. Even these require special consideration at the hands of the Government. Under the new province the Oriyas residing in this area cannot be expected to receive the same attention which they are having at the hands of the Government of Madras all along.

" Now, Sir, there is another reason why the Vizagapatam Agency tract should not be transferred to the new province. There is the Godavari Delta system, which is mainly dependent upon the forests for the rains which give us the full supply of water for our irrigation channels. If that tract is to be taken away by the new province then the forests situated in those tracts will also go away into their hands, and there is the danger of the delta system being affected, which in its turn might ultimately affect the rest of the country.

" Now, Sir, there is the question of the transfer of certain portions of the Ganjam district. The whole Committee is unanimous in recommending certain portions to be transferred to the new province.

" On the question of Parlakimedi estate there is a difference of opinion between the President and the other members of the Committee.

2nd August 1932] [Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari]

The same arguments which I have adduced with reference to the Vizagapatam Agency tract would apply with equal force so far as the aboriginal tribes residing in these areas are concerned.

"The reasons given with reference to the inclusion of Berhampur taluk and Parlakimedi taluk will have to be specially considered. In the case of the Berhampur taluk there is the Berhampur town. As hon. Members of this House are aware Berhampur town is mostly populated by Telugus. It is more a Telugu town than an Oriya town. Forty-eight per cent of the people of the town are Telugus. The town is built up by the enterprise of the Telugus. The Telugu inhabitants of the town have vested interests in the town. Is it fair that such a town should be transferred to the new province?

"Then with regard to the Parlakimedi estate, the case made out by the other members of the Committee is unconvincing. The President has stated that the argument that the Telugu people of Parlakimedi estate are in favour of goiug into the new province is unreal. He is quite right when he said that he cannot simply believe this. The Committee has set before itself certain tests which ought to be satisfied before certain tracts can be assigned to the new province. Two of these tests are the race test and the language test. If we apply the race test, we find that 53 per cent of the people living in Parlakimedi estate are Telugus and less than 24 per cent are Oriyas. If we apply the language test, then we find that 63 per cent of the population are Telugus and less than 21 per cent are Oriyas. Where then, Sir, is the case for the transfer of Parlakimedi estate made out? Finally there is one general and most important argument which I would submit in support of the motion made by the hon. the Raja Sahib of Bobbili, namely, the desirability of avoiding, as far as possible, the minorities question in the new province; I would say, Sir, that the minorities question is a question which is troubling every country wherever it exists. That is a problem which ought to be avoided as far as possible.

"Let me make my position quite clear. I am not for opposing the demand of the Oriyas if it is financially a practicable proposition. The principle to be adopted in the formation of a new province is the principle of including only such tracts where the Oriyas are predominantly large in numbers. If this test is to be followed then Parlakimedi estate ought to be excluded, and a portion of Berhampur taluk also, including Berhampur town will have to be excluded. Wherever you find non-Oriyas residing in large numbers, exclude them in forming the new province and include only those tracts where Oriyas are predominating in numbers; then we shall have no quarrel with the Government. If, on the other hand, Government should accept the recommendations of the Committee wholesale, then I am afraid Government will be courting trouble on its head. We know what it is to partition a country against the wishes of a large section of the public. We know what it was in Bengal when it was divided. If it is the intention of Government to accept the recommendations of the Committee wholesale then we shall not be wrong if we interpret their attitude as an attempt to dismember the Andhra country. That is a matter which Government would do

well to consider very carefully before they take any definite action in the matter. The feeling in the country in this matter is very strong and intense. At a meeting presided over by Sir Kurma Reddi, the other day at Bezwada, which was attended by people from all parts of the Andhra country—it was a full meeting—this question was freely and fully discussed and the unanimous opinion of the meeting was that the recommendations of the Committee ought to be modified on the lines suggested by me, namely, to exclude the tracts where the Telugus are predominantly large in numbers from the new province. It does not matter if there is a small number of Andhras in the tracts proposed to be added to the new province. If there is any tract which is sought to be added in the new province where the number of Telugus is larger than the number of Oriyas then the feeling in the country against inclusion is so strong that Government cannot afford to ignore it without really complicating the position in the country which is already bad. I, therefore, support the motion of the hon. Member from Vizagapatam."

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—" Mr. President, Sir, we are, in this Council, four representatives from the Ganjam district constituency, one of whom represents the special constituency of landholders (Oriya and Telugu) and two of whom are Oriyas, represent the general constituency and myself a Telugu, who has been associated with Oriya zamindars for generations and have the honour of being one of the originators of the movement of Utkal union, to bring together all the Oriya-speaking people under one administration for the promotion of culture, race, language and material advancement of the Oriyas. I supported the plea of a separate province at the Round Table Conference. It is a pity that the Raja of Parlakimedi is not able to be present here to-day, for by his able advocacy he may have thrown light on the arguments in support of the area he is interested in.

" There has been agitation for a separate province since 1901 and many reports and despatches of this Government are now available to Government to formulate a consistent policy on the lines of predominance of language or race in any area to be excluded, though other factors may also play not an insignificant part in the final shaping of the decision relating to such parts of the province as might come within the new province. I agree with the Raja of Khallikote that the report under consideration does not contain all the necessary materials, but to those who reside in the area, the facts are quite familiar.

" Personally, I am in an independent position and am quite disinterested as I hold properties both in the northern and southern parts of the district and do not think that there should be any bitter controversy in the matter. The differences are, in my view, capable of being adjusted amicably by proper understanding.

" As at present understood until there is a change in the programme and procedure, this subject is placed on the agenda of the Consultative Committee. The despatches of the Governments of Madras and of India will also be available for making definite recommendations to His Majesty's Government. As a member of that body, I do not desire to prejudge the issue raised in the debate before the House."

2nd August 1932] [Mr. P. C. Moses]

* Mr. P. C. Moses:—" Mr. President, Sir, as a member representing Indian Christians of the northern districts, I desire very much to express my views on the question under discussion. In framing their proposals the Orissa Committee took account of language, subsidiary language, the race and the wishes of the people. They also attached primary importance to the wishes of the inhabitants of the tract proposed to become part of the new province, and they proceeded on the principle that only very exceptional circumstances could justify the transfer of an area against the wishes of its inhabitants. Sir, in paragraph 65 on page 26 of the report the concluding sentence reads thus:—

'It is unfortunate that this area includes a Telugu fringe; but the narrow coastal belt in which they predominate cannot be detached from the interior, and the wishes of a small minority cannot be the determining factor.'

" Here is an instance of the reversal of the principles which the members of the Committee have taken into consideration in determining the boundaries. Two facts are evident from this statement, that the Telugus predominate in large numbers and they intensely desire to be left where they have been. To my mind there is no force in the objection that the narrow strip of land could not be detached. No arguments have been advanced why this small belt should not be detached from the interior. Perhaps they are not insuperable; not even serious difficulties. I therefore plead that this narrow coastal belt should be retained in the Madras province. Then again, Sir, I strongly support the opinion of the Chairman on the subject of the inclusion of the Zamindari of Parlakimedi. The other two members of the Committee in framing their recommendation for the transfer of the area argued that the Telugu tenants are happy and contented and that they desire to go along with the zamindar to the new province.

" One would naturally expect that the Telugus would be opposed to such a transfer; a transfer, which would involve separation from a rich province to a poor province, a transfer which would involve separation from the Andhra University which provides special educational facilities for the Telugus. Under these circumstances the Telugus should advance stronger reasons than those mentioned in the report so that they may not argue differently if there is to be a change in the policy of administration. In paragraph 71 the Committee make mention of the places which should be transferred to the new province of Orissa. Going through the statistics I find there is one feature not taken into consideration by the Committee with regard to some areas of the Vizagapatam Agency which are proposed to be transferred to the Oriya province. The population classified in the report as ' neither ' preponderates over the Telugus and Oriyas put together. The principal consideration in determining the boundaries is the wishes of the people. If the principal consideration is the wishes of the people, and if they are not in a position to give their opinion, the Legislative Council and the Government should decide for them. What is good for them should be done for them. It is for His Majesty's Government to decide finally for them whether it is beneficial for them to be transferred to the deficit province 4-30 p.m.

or to remain in the Madras Province. I am definitely for the formation of the Orissa Province. By all means the desire of the Oriyas which in my opinion is quite legitimate should be met with but the province should be formed with such exceptions as I pointed out in the course of my speech."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Mr. President, Sir, I should think that the Council should feel immensely grateful to the hon. the Revenue Member for bringing up this subject before this Legislative Council to elicit its opinion with regard to the Report of the Orissa Commission. As you are aware, Sir, our rules and regulations consist of so many checks and counter-checks that the hon. the Revenue Member might easily have tabooed the discussion on this subject on the ground that it is not primarily the concern of the Local Government or that the discussion of this subject might embarrass the proposals of the Government of India to the Home Government, I should think that if the analogy that the Government followed in respect of the other motion is followed here the motion should have also been tabooed by the hon. the Revenue Member and we should have been denied the privilege of discussing this subject. He does not know why those gentlemen who are in favour of consulting this report should ask for an adjournment on the ground, at any rate, on the stated ground that they were not prepared with the material to proceed with the discussion on this subject. Apart from one or two persons whose contention that they did not study the subject-matter of this discussion being correct and true, I do not think, Sir, it would be possible for us to believe that those gentlemen who have taken a prominent part in the discussion of this subject would have considered the non-study of the material as proper ground for adjourning this question. As a matter of fact the speech made by the Raja of Khallikhote let the cat out of the bag. He did not want a discussion from this Council for the reason that they are in a hopeless minority. He never expected the decision to be in his favour. He, therefore, wanted to resort to the devise of adjournment so that he may try his hand with the Government of India. When he thinks that the Government of India might come to his support, he is reckoning without the host. The Government of India have already expressed their opinion on the general question of formation of provinces that the whole question is one. In fact this question of the formation of provinces on linguistic provinces was started by the Andhras. There might be many reasons for supporting that agitation. (Interruptions.) Well, I have no objection for yielding the palm to the Oriyas for supporting the agitation for the formation of provinces on linguistic basis. I dare say the chief impetus for the formation of province on linguistic basis is because that sections of population feel that their interests are neglected in the conglomeration of many other races and languages. So that each one community wanted separate administration as their interests might receive better attention at the hands of the Government. Whether their interests consisted in the improvement of land, or whether their interests consisted in the improvement of the trade and commerce or whether their interests consisted in

2nd August 1932] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti]

fighting for jobs in Government it is immaterial. People did really want that their interests should be carefully attended to by the administration to which they could have easy access. Big communities representing particular language or race should form a geographical unit for the purpose of administration is a very legitimate aspiration. I am one of those who believe that probably better improvement would result by the formation of provinces of that sort. But that proposition must always be secondary to that of finance. But if the province is to face deficits it will not be proper for the mere satisfaction of sentiment to have a linguistic province and face the deficit year after year. Nor would it be a proper proposition even if the Government of India are in a mood to give subventions year after year for each province. I do not think, Sir, that the Government of India, if ever it did, is now in a position to give subsidies to any province. Having regard to that fact which it is impossible to counteract it seems to me that the formation of provinces on linguistic basis whether it be for Oriyas or Andhras is a transfer which is not in the immediate prospect of fructification. It is very likely that the whole question might end with academic discussion. But the Government of India and the Home Government should know the feelings of these people from whom it is sought to take a considerable portion of territory. Now it is also conceded not only by the Government of India but also by the Secretary of State for India in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report that in the matter of division of provinces every care should be taken that no new causes of animosities, irritation or bickerings are given rise to in order to allay the existing ones. If that test is applied this Commission while recognizing that to be the test by which the provinces should be redistributed does not seem to have given their due weight in their recommendations. Large tracts of land which are inhabited by predominantly Telugu population are sought to be taken away and added on to the Orissa Province. I do not think the Oriyas themselves would feel quite comfortable with a strong minority in the province. Even as they say that their feelings, their interests are neglected, that they are not properly represented, that they can never stand to improve in a province where other races or other communities representing other languages predominate, the Telugu minority will feel. The Raja of Khallikhote has made a very important contention in favour of forming the Orissa Province, viz., that their interests are neglected. Same questions may arise in the minds of the Telugus when these tracts are transferred. Would the Raja of Khallikhote be willing to give to the Telugus of Gumsur, Berhampur and Parlakimedi more than two or three seats in the Oriya Province. (The Raja of Khallikhote: Four seats.) You are no better now. You are four here. One gentleman does not want to prejudge the issue though he had many occasions to judge and dictate. Another gentleman who has estates in particular parts does not want those parts to be taken away for the new province. The third gentleman supports because he stands to gain. Sir, therefore, this problem will arise with all minorities and the only solution for avoiding such bickerings will be to allow these minorities to go to a place where they want to remain. I do not think there is any doubt on this point.

[Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti] [2nd August 1932

They do not want to be adopted to the new province. They want to be left alone. The Raja of Bobbili has laid down a line of demarcation excluding the Telugu tracts. Except in one or two places neither the Oriyas nor the Telugus are in a majority. There seems to be a neutral population which does not come either as Oriyas or Telugus. That is no reason why their vote should be in favour of Oriyas. It might as well be in favour of Telugus. There is one fact which appeals to me why those tracts should be in the Madras Province. I do not think that Madras is either thoroughly Telugu or Tamil. So I have no bias for Tamils or Telugus inasmuch as I want this to be with the Madras Presidency. The Madras Presidency is in a position to expend the monies for the improvement of those tracts and for the betterment of that population whereas the Oriyas will be in a great handicap when these questions of reclaiming these people arise. Sir, so far as the Government of Madras is concerned I am glad to find that they agree with the point of view put forward by the Telugus of these tracts. As a matter of fact in 1926 in their despatch to the Government of India in answer to a reference from the Government of Bengal they made the following observations:—

'It is shown there that the transfer would give rise to serious difficulties in connexion with the linguistic and racial conditions and the geographical conformation of the tract in question, that it would greatly complicate and confuse its judicial arrangements, and that it would place the administration of its peculiar land revenue system in the languages of officers who would have no acquaintance with the principles on which it is based or with the language in which the bulk of its records are and must continue to be maintained.'

"This despatch was made by the Government of Madras in consultation with the Ministry which then consisted of my hon. Friend Sir Patro who would not like to judge the issue at present. I, therefore, Sir, have great pleasure in supporting the motion made by the Raja of Bobbili."

15 m. * Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"Mr. President, Sir, now the question before the House is whether certain areas proposed to be transferred to the new province to be created should be transferred or not from the Madras Presidency. The hon. the Raja of Bobbili moved an amendment that the area north of the Rushikulya river and also north of the Ghodahado river may be taken into the new province and the rest not. Well, some hon. Members called upon him to state what those areas are and what his reasons are for saying that the areas south of that line should not go into the new province. Unfortunately, he has not been able to give his reasons, or at all events he has not tried to elucidate his position till now. As he has got the Report of the Committee, which he seems to have studied well, he ought to have spoken in terms of the language of the Report. That is to say the Report refers to the various taluks in the district. Well, I think for the clear understanding by the several hon. Members of this House, he ought to have taken that course if he cared to convince the Members of this House. But he is sure of carrying this motion with the help of Government. Anyhow, this motion, it seems, is also brought forward

2nd August 1932] [Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo]

to strengthen the hands of the Government. The result is well assured in his favour, and therefore he did not care to make the proposition clear. He clubbed in one motion several matters which ought to have been split up as was pointed out by the hon. Member from Malabar. So far as I could understand that proposition, I should say if a line is drawn as proposed by the Raja Sahib of Bobbili, I think the Kodala taluk will go to the new province as well as a portion of the Chatrapur taluk and the whole of the Gumsur division. He tried to exclude the zamindaris of Bodokimidi, Zarada, Chikati and Surangi. I cannot understand how he can claim these areas to be retained in the Madras Presidency. What are the tests to be applied? Apply any test you like, and you will find that these areas cannot be retained. So far as the Berhampur town is concerned, the Oriya and the Andhra population is equal. As stated by the Census Superintendent of the Madras Presidency, the tendency for foreigners is to congregate in towns. That is the reason why you find in all towns a preponderating group of people speaking the Telugu language. Though Berhampur taluk is not decidedly so, Berhampur town is an instance in point. Even in Aska you find the Telugu population preponderating, even in Russelkonda or in Chatrapur, which is only an official colony. At a time when the Oriyas were uneducated and when the Oriyas were compelled to read in schools where only Telugu was taught and when the Oriya language was not the court language, people from the south went there as officials and settled down in those towns. That is the reason why you find in those towns a preponderance of the Telugu population. On that ground you cannot claim that the whole of the Berhampur taluk should be retained in the Madras Presidency. Thus you find that the hon. Mover has not given satisfactory reasons at all for retaining them in the Madras Presidency. He generally said that in those tracts the Telugus preponderate. Let him show by facts and figures the grounds on which he takes his stand. Did he refer to any census figures? Did he refer to the report of the Orissa Committee where the figures are given both by race and by mother tongue? He has utterly failed to maintain his position and I believe he really does not know what areas are included in his own proposition. As he said, as a representative of the Vizagapatam district he had to move this motion. Naturally of course, we know that the Vizagapatam city will be much affected if Jeypur is transferred. Jeypur, so to speak, is an appendage of the Vizagapatam bar. If Jeypur is transferred, the Vizagapatam people will be affected and that is the reason why he fights against the transfer of Jeypur though the Committee state that there is no case made out at all against the transfer so far as the Vizagapatam Agency was concerned. While that is what they clearly stated, what is the evidence let in and what are the arguments put forward by the Andhras so far as the Jeypur Agency is concerned? (Sir A. P. Patro: The ancient boundary of Kalinga.) Of course, I shall come to Kalinga later on.

"Now, as the hon. the Revenue Member pointed out, we have to consider the question from certain standpoints. First of all, it should be considered historically. I shall just read a passage from the famous

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo] [2nd August 1932

Firmingher's Fifth Report. In Volume III of the well-known Firmingher's *Fifth Report on East India Affairs (1 & 2) at page 79,* the Oriyas are described as the natives of the soil. In dealing with the Raj family *of Vizianagram in the Vizagapatam district in Volume III* of the report it is stated as follows:—

'In general the history of all the Ranzees, or tribe of Raobewar in the *circars, trace their origin to a dependence on the ancient rajas of the country* either as Chelaks or favoured slaves, managers, talukdars or renters of the subdivisions of the sovereign domain; and such also was the rise of all the other petty holders of land existing in this province, whether descended from the Velmawars of Telinga, or natives of the soil itself properly called Oriya.'

"In dealing with the population of the Northern Circars, Mr. James Grant in his political survey of the Northern Circars reproduced in Volume III of the Fifth Report says:—

'They (the native inhabitants of Northern Circars) are parts of the two nations of Telinga and Oriya, *Woria* or Orissa formerly divided from each other by the Godavari, but since their union under the Government a good deal mixed among themselves, as well as with some of the neighbouring tribes.'

"Therefore, you can clearly see the real boundary between the Telanga country and the Orissa country was the river Godavari. After the downfall of the Orissa kingdom, the northern portion was taken over by the Mahrattas and the southern portion by the Nizam. When the Nizam ruled this part of the country, the Telugus who predominated in the Nizam's Dominion entered this part of the country. So, you will *find most of the zamindars you find in the Godavari and in the other* districts of the Circars trace their origin from the officials or the farmers of revenue under the Nawab and all these people came from the south or from the Nizam's Dominions. Therefore, it can be easily seen that this part also was part of the Orissa country. Ultimately Oriyas had to seek shelter in the wild tracts of the country when the Orissa kingdom fell and the Oriyas were defeated on this side and also on the other side. It is also stated in the report itself that most of the zamindars were in the Ganjam district where they were appointed as Lords of the Marshes by the King of Puri. The report accepts that theory. It is also stated in the report that the Oriyas held sway even beyond the Kistna river. So, it is clear that it is only in the sixteenth or seventeenth century that the Telugus came to occupy the tract even between the Ganjam district and the Godavari river. You find reference to an Orissa Governor on the banks of the Godavari in the life of Chaitanya, known as Roy Ramanand. The great Lord Gouranga met him on the banks of the Godavari. Now the place has been spotted and marked by a small temple built there. Therefore, there is no doubt that Oriyas held sway over this part of the country also."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Discussion on this motion will be continued on the next available day. Probably the next available day will be the 4th or the 5th instant which is to be fixed in consultation with His Excellency who is to allot non-official days.

"The Council will now adjourn and meet again to-morrow at 11 a.m."

X.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

1. [1] *Memorandum, dated the* 21*st March* 1932, *of the Revenue Department with reference to question No.* 557, *dated the* 3*rd November* 1931.

2. [2] *U.O. Note, dated the* 11*th April* 1932, *from the Public* (*Services*) *Department with reference to the supplementary answer to question No.* 774, *dated* 28*th January* 1932.

3. [3] *A report on the floods which occurred in the Ganjam, Vizagapatam and West Godavari districts in October and November* 1931.

4. [4] *G.O. No.* 801, *L. & M., dated* 1*st March* 1932, *approving the payment of tax at half-rates for third and fourth quarters of* 1931–32 *in respect of certain vehicles not using public roads.*

5. [5] *G.O. No.* 945, *L. & M., dated* 12*th March* 1932, *regarding the appointment of M.R.Ry. Rai Bahadur N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar Avargal, B.A., B.L., as member of the committee to enquire into the incidence of taxation on motor vehicles in the Madras Presidency.*

6. [6] *G.O. No.* 201, *Development, dated* 15*th February* 1932, *recording the audit report on the accounts of the Government Fisheries Cannery, Chaliyam, for the year ending* 31*st March* 1931.

7. [4] *Memorandum No.* 14216-*C, L. & M., dated* 22*nd April* 1932, *regarding the payment of tax at half-rates in respect of certain motor vehicles not using public roads.*

8. [7] *A report on the floods which occurred in the Tinnevelly, Trichinopoly, Tanjore and South Arcot districts in December* 1931.

9. [6] *G.O. No.* 234, *Development, dated* 19*th February* 1932, *recording the audit report on the accounts of the Government Industrial Institute, Madura, for the year ending* 31*st March* 1931.

10. [4] *G.O. No.* 1114, *L. & M., dated* 23*rd March* 1932, *fixing the date of retirement of members of local boards.*

11. [6] *G.O. No.* 493, *Development, dated* 9*th April* 1932, *recording the audit report on the accounts of the Chenat Nair Exploitation Division for the year* 1930–31.

12. [6] *Proceedings of the meetings of the Finance Committee held on the* 8*th and* 17*th March* 1932.

13. [8] *U.O. Note No.* 10392-*A*-2, *Public* (*General*), *dated the* 19*th May* 1932, *with reference to the answer given to question No.* 1056 *in the Legislative Council on the* 24*th March* 1932.

14. [9] *U.O. Note No.* 4196-3, *Public* (*General*), *dated* 23*rd May* 1932, *with reference to the answer given to clause* (*a*) *of question No.* 1252 *in the Legislative Council on the* 24*th March* 1932.

---

[1] Printed as Appendix VII on page 118 infra.

[2] Printed as Appendix VIII on page 119 infra.

[3] Printed as Appendix IX on pages 119—125 infra.

[4] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette.*

[5] Placed on Editors' Table.

[6] Printed separately.

[7] Printed as Appendix X on pages 125—131 infra.

[8] Printed as Appendix XI on pages 131–132 infra.

[9] Printed as Appendix XII on page 132 infra.

000029388

15. [1] *U.O. Note No.* 8836-2, *Public (General), dated the* 23*rd May* 1932, *with reference to the answer given to question No.* 1103 *in the Legislative Council on the* 23*rd March* 1932.

16. [2] *U.O. Note No.* 10280-2, *Public (General), dated* 23*rd May* 1932, *with reference to the answer to clauses (c) and (d) of question No.* 1112 *given in the Legislative Council on* 24*th March* 1932.

17. [3] *U.O. Note No.* 10353-2, *Public (General), dated* 25*th May* 1932, *with reference to the answer given in the Legislative Council to question No.* 1057 *on the* 19*th March* 1932.

18. [4] *List of posts on Rs.* 500 *per mensem and above created during the quarter ending March* 1932.

19. [5] *G.O. No.* 589, *Development, dated* 28*th April* 1932, *recording the audit report on the accounts of the Forest Utilization Division, Madras, for the year ended* 31*st March* 1931.

20. [5] *G.O. No.* 602, *Development, dated* 30*th April* 1932, *recording the audit report on the accounts of the Mount Stuart Working Circle for the year ended* 31*st March* 1931.

21. [6] *G.O. No.* 1590, *L. & M., dated* 2*nd May* 1932, *exempting the motor lorry No. M.C./P.* 4124 *from the payment of the tax for third quarter of* 1931–32.

22. [7] *G.O. No.* 266, *Finance, dated* 4*th May* 1932, *regarding the constitution of the Public Accounts and Finance Committees,* 1932–33.

23. [8] *G.O. No.* 1884, *L. & M., dated* 23*rd May* 1932, *fixing the date of retirement of members of certain panchayats.*

24. [9] *G.O. No.* 1944, *L. & M., dated* 27*th May* 1932, *fixing the date of retirement of members of panchayats (ex-unions).*

25. [10] *G.O. No.* 2132, *L. & M., dated* 8*th June* 1932, *fixing the date of retirement of members of Manamadura panchayat (Ramnad district).*

26. [6] *G.O. No.* 2220, *L. & M., dated* 11*th June* 1932, *cancelling the rules issued in G.O. No.* 1645, *L. & M., dated* 15*th May* 1931, *regarding the production of licences on demand and institution of proceedings for the recovery of taxes.*

27. [11] *U.O. No.* 8832–3, *Public (General), dated* 30*th May* 1932, *with reference to the answer given to question No.* 1102 *in the Legislative Council on the* 23*rd March* 1932.

---

[1] Printed as Appendix XIII on page 133 infra.
[2] Printed as Appendix XIV on page 133 infra.
[3] Printed as Appendix XV on page 134 infra.
[4] Printed as Appendix XVI on pages 135–136 infra.
[5] Printed separately.
[6] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette.*
[7] Printed as Appendix XVII on page 137 infra.
[8] Placed on Editor's Table.
[9] Printed as Appendix XVIII on page 138 infra.
[10] Printed as Appendix XIX on page 139 infra.
[11] Printed as Appendix XX on pages 139–140 infra.

2nd August 1932]

28. [1] *U.O. No.* 8835–1, *Public (General), dated* 30*th May* 1932, *with reference to the answer to question No.* 1075 *given in the Legislative Council on the* 21*st March* 1932.

29. [2] *U.O. No.* 10129–2, *Public (General), dated* 30*th May* 1932, *with reference to the answer to question No.* 1100 *given in the Legislative Council on the* 23*rd March* 1932.

30. [3] *U.O. No.* 10592–2, *Public (General), dated* 30*th May* 1932, *with reference to the answer to question No.* 1120 *given in the Legislative Council on the* 24*th March* 1932.

31. [4] *U.O. No.* 8835–2, *Public (General), dated* 31*st May* 1932, *with reference to the answer given to question No.* 1074 *in the Legislative Council on the* 21*st March* 1932.

32. [5] *U.O. No.* 8839–2, *Public (General), dated* 4*th June* 1932, *with reference to the answer to question No.* 1101 *answered in the Legislative Council on the* 23*rd March* 1932.

33. [6] *U.O. No.* 10136–2, *Public (General), dated* 4*th June* 1932, *with reference to the answer to question No.* 1176 *given in the Legislative Council on the* 24*th March* 1932.

34. [7] *U.O. Note No.* 10092–3, *Public (General), dated* 17*th June* 1932, *with reference to the answer given to question No.* 1121 *in the Legislative Council on the* 24*th March* 1932.

35. [8] *U.O. Note No.* 9462–2, *dated* 20*th June* 1932, *with reference to the answer to the supplementary question to question No.* 1237 *given in the Legislative Council on* 24*th March* 1932.

36. [9] *U.O Note No.* 10783–2, *dated* 20*th June* 1932, *with reference to the answer to the Legislative Council question No.* 1259 *given on* 24*th March* 1932.

37. [10] *U.O. Note No.* 10818–2, *Public (General), dated* 20*th June* 1932, *with reference to the answer to question No.* 1258 *given on* 24*th March* 1932.

38. [11] *G.O. No.* 2482, *L. & M., dated* 27*th June* 1932, *fixing the date of retirement of members of certain panchayats (ex-unions).*

39. [12] *G.O. No.* 2500, *L. & M., dated* 27*th June* 1932, *fixing the date of retirement of members of district and toluk boards and panchayats (other than ex-unions).*

40. [13] *G.O. No.* 2484, *L. & M., dated* 27*th June* 1932, *notifying the exclusion of Mettur taluk from areas of the Salem and Coimbatore District Boards.*

---

[1] Printed as Appendix XXI on page 140 infra.

[2] Printed as Appendix XXII on pages 140–141 infra.

[3] Printed as Appendix XXIII on pages 141–142 infra.

[4] Printed as Appendix XXIV on page 142 infra.

[5] Printed as Appendix XXV on page 143 infra.

[6] Printed as Appendix XXVI on page 144 infra.

[7] Printed as Appendix XXVII on pages 144–145 infra.

[8] Printed as Appendix XXVIII on pages 145–146 infra.

[9] Printed as Appendix XXIX on pages 146–147 infra.

[10] Printed as Appendix XXX on page 147 infra.

[11] Printed as Appendix XXXI on page 148 infra.

[12] Printed as Appendix XXXII on page 149 infra.

[13] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette.*

[2nd August 1932

41. [1]*G.O. No.* 2585, *L. & M., dated* 4*th July* 1932, *fixing the date of retirement of members of the Tiruvallur Taluk Board and for the coming into office of members of new taluk boards in the Chingleput district.*

42. [2]*G.O. No.* 652, *Development, dated* 12*th May* 1932, *recording the audit report on the accounts of the Industrial Engineering Workshop for the year ending with* 31*st March* 1931.

43. [3]*Communication from the Public (General) Department, dated* 27*th June* 1932, *with reference to clause (f) of question No.* 1223 *answered in the Legislative Council on the* 24*th March* 1932 *and the answer to the supplementary question thereto.*

44. [4]*U.O. Note No.* 10276–1, *Public (General), dated the* 18*th May* 1932, *with reference to the answer to clause (b) of question No.* 1119 *given in the Council on the* 24*th March* 1932.

45. [5]*Communication No.* 22334/*ER*/1, *dated* 11*th July* 1932, *from the Finance Department with reference to the question No.* 394 *and to supplementary question thereto on* 31*st October* 1931.

46. [6]*U.O. Note No.* 10130–2, *Public (General), dated* 9*th June* 1932, *with reference to the supplementary questions and answers given in the Legislative Council on the* 24*th March* 1932 *with reference to question No.* 1220.

47. [7]*U.O. Note No.* 8837–3, *Public (General), dated* 9*th June* 1932, *with reference to the answer to question No.* 1113 *given in the Legislative Council on the* 24*th March* 1932.

48. [1]*G.O. No.* 2576, *L. & M., dated* 4*th July* 1932, *notifying the exemption of a motor crane belonging to the Madura Mills Company, Ltd., from payment of tax.*

49. [2]*G.O. No.* 842 (20–*S*), *Development, dated* 20*th June* 1932, *passing orders on the audit report on the accounts of the Nilambur Forests division for the year ended* 31*st March* 1931.

50. [8]*Statement of action taken on resolutions passed by the Council during the Second Session of the Fourth Legislative Council.*

51. [2]*G.O. No.* 531, *Development, dated* 20*th April* 1932, *recording the audit report on the accounts of the Kerala Soap Institute, Calicut, for the year ending* 31*st March* 1931.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

---

[1] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette.*

[2] Printed separately.

[3] Printed as Appendix XXXIII on page 150 infra.

[4] Printed as Appendix XXXIV on pages 150–151 infra.

[5] Printed as Appendix XXXV on page 152 infra.

[6] Printed as Appendix XXXVI on page 152 infra.

[7] Printed as Appendix XXXVII on page 153 infra.

[8] Printed as Appendix XXXVIII on pages 153—155 infra.

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to question No. 7 asked by Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd August 1932, page 20 supra.]

To

The Hon'ble the HOME MEMBER,
Government of Madras,
Fort St. George.

HONOURED SIR,

I, the undersigned along with Mr. J. Pattabhiramayya, was picketing foreign cloth shops yesterday evening in the Robertsonpet square, Masulipatam. Police took us to the Robertsonpet station and kept us there till late in the night. They put us some questions about our property and our previous connexion with the Congress. Mr. Pattabhiramayya was let off with two blows at about 8-30 p.m. I was then taken into the lock up where two head constables handled me roughly.

One of them kicked me in the chest. I fell down. I was pulled up by the ears and the other kicked me in the back. I was beaten with a cane on the knees. I am feeling awful pain in the chest and am not able to breathe freely. I was let off at eleven in the night. One of the head constables spat on my face. I submit these facts for your sympathetic consideration.

BANDAR,
28th March 1932.

Yours obediently,
(Signed) PAMIREDDI GHANTAREDDI,
Dokiparru.

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 25 asked by Mr. R. M. Palat at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd August 1932, page 33 supra.]

Letter from the Collector of Malabar, Calicut, Ref. No. C. 7-5269/32, *dated 27th May* 1932.

[Cyclones—Malabar district—Damages.]

South Malabar was visited by a severe cyclonic storm on the night of May 24th. Though there was rain throughout the district, the strong wind, which was mainly from the west, was confined to portions of Calicut, Kurumbranad, Ernad and Ponnani taluks. The area affected runs along the coast from Quilandy in the north to Ponnani in the south and extends, so far as I can ascertain, about 20 miles inland. Trees have been blown down in large numbers all over this area, many houses

have collapsed and about one house in four has sustained appreciable damage. Telegraph and telephone wires have been cut and roads blocked by fallen trees, and communications consequently seriously interrupted. Railway transport has not been interfered with but trains are running somewhat late owing to the interruption of telegraphic and telephonic communications and to fear of possible breaches.

2. So far no serious floods have occurred. As the rain abated on the 25th there was a tendency for the waters to subside but the Deputy Tahsildar, Tirurangady, reports that the Kadalundi river is rising. He is taking the necessary precautions to evacuate people from low-lying places.

3. So far I have had reports of 16 deaths, most of them of children, caused by the collapse of houses or by falling trees.

4. The female portion of the sub-jail, Calicut, was flooded out, the inmates being removed temporarily to the sub-jail office room and locked up there for the night guarded by the female warder. The cells were dried and made habitable next day.

5. The Branch Settlement Office at Calicut had a portion of its roof blown away and the records had to be taken to the Taluk office. The Malabar Club on the sea front suffered severely, large portions of the roof being blown away and billiard tables and other property being damaged.

6. There was no damage to shipping at the Port of Calicut. The total rainfall in Calicut from 8 a.m. on the 24th to 8 a.m. on the 25th was 10·75 inches.

7. Though the damage by the storm is heavy and widespread, there is not at present any need for relief measures on a large scale by Government. Individual sufferers will be given such help and shelter as is necessary. I will summon a meeting of the Malabar Distress Relief Fund Committee which has considerable funds at its disposal, should there be necessity to do so.

Letter from the Collector of Malabar, dated the 15*th July* 1932, *Ref. No. C.* 7-5269/32.

[Cyclone—Malabar district—Damages—Report—My Ref. No. C. 7-5269/32, dated 27th May 1932.]

In continuation of the above report I submit a detailed account of the damage caused by the cyclone on the night of the 24th May.

Damage to human life.—Seven deaths have been reported from Ponnani, 17 from Ernad and 13 from Calicut taluk.

Damage to livestock.—Three hundred and forty-five head of cattle from Ponnani and 500 from Ernad are reported to have been lost. The loss under this item is not appreciable in Calicut taluk.

Public buildings.—A few public offices and amsam cutcherries have sustained slight damages but the loss on this account is not considerable.

2nd August 1932]

Communications.—Besides damage caused to local fund roads by wind-fallen trees, there were breaches in some of the roads as a result of the heavy rain. Damage was also caused to culverts and bridges. Damage to roads is estimated at Rs. 89,460; and to culverts and bridges at Rs. 1,39,600. The loss suffered by local fund building is about Rs. 4,500.

Dwelling houses.—In Ponnani taluk 4,164 dwelling houses have been blown down or made uninhabitable. These are mostly huts with mud walls and cadjan roofs or made of cadjan materials alone. The loss in individual cases will not be more than Rs. 10. About 500 private buildings have been similarly affected in Ernad taluk. In Calicut taluk 597 houses have collapsed while 480 have been partly damaged.

Boats.—Ninety boats were lost in Ponnani taluk due to the falling of trees.

Damage to crops.—Thousands of fruit-bearing trees, coconut, arecanut and jack, have been uprooted. The loss from the falling of trees is estimated at about Rs. 9 lakhs in each of the taluks of Ernad and Ponnani and about 1½ lakhs in Calicut taluk. These figures are of course only a rough general estimate. In addition to this, a large number of trees have had their roots loosened. This affects the young coconuts ripening on them and is likely to reduce their yield by about 25 per cent during the next eight months. The loss to paddy and other crops was negligible as the floods subsided quickly.

Relief measures.—A meeting of the Malabar Distress Relief Fund Committee was held on the 30th May and a sum of Rs. 2,000 was sanctioned from the funds of the Committee for relief in urgent and deserving cases. Another meeting was held on the 29th June and it was resolved that a further sum of Rs. 1,500 be made available for immediate relief of sufferers from the cyclone. The Malabar District Board and the Calicut Municipality have each proposed to contribute Rs. 200. These amounts will be available when sanction has been obtained from the Inspector of Local Boards and Municipal Councils. A sum of Rs. 180 was collected from Palghat by Rao Sahib N. N. Rama Ayyar and Mr. S. K. Ramaswami Ayyar, Chairman, Municipal Council, Palghat. The greater part of the funds available have already been distributed either by the aid of Government officials or by the workers of the Servants of India Society. In a portion of Calicut town the Malabar Welfare Association undertook the relief work, which they performed by the distribution of actual materials bought from the relief fund, among the fisher community who were badly affected. Their work involved the expenditure of much personal energy and time and was most particularly useful in that owing to the economic circumstances of these people, money grants would probably have got into the hands of their creditors. I wish to bring to the notice of Government the prompt and useful work done by Lady Barber, Miss M. Janaki and the Rev. A. T. Coldman in this respect.

The remaining relief in the Municipality was distributed through the Chairman.

Although numerous petitions for assistance were received, relief was distributed only in cases verified by actual investigation. I consider that help has been given where it was really essential and that it was undesirable to attempt to do any more than this from charitable funds.

Appendix III.

[Vide answer to question No. 26 asked by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd August 1932, page 33 supra.]

Statement showing the works for the employment of unskilled labourers in Bellary district during the second fortnight of May 1932.

I. *Road works*—

1. Laying out a road from Kurugodu to Emmiganuru.
2. Repairing the road from Kolur to Kurugodu.
3. Repairs to Bellary-Siruguppa road.
4. Laying out a road from Bellary to Talur—2 camps.
5. Completion of the road from Moka to Gulyam.
6. Repairing the road from the Goschen Bridge to the 20th mile, Bellary-Kurnool road—2 camps.
7. Laying out a road from Bellary to Siddamanahalli.
8. Laying out a road from Bevinahal railway station to Chintakunta.
9. Laying out a road from Yerur to Bantanahal railway station.
10. Repairs to the road from Bellary to Kudatini.

II. *Water-supply works*—

1. Three works at Chintakunta.
2. One work at Kokkarachedu.
3. One work at Sirugapuram.
4. One work at Bevinahal.
5. One work at Seedarahalu.
6. Two works at Gummanuru.
7. One work at Bantanahalu.

List of test works started in Bellary.

1. Road from Kolagal to Siddamanahalli.
2. Completion of road from Korlagundi to Talur, 1½ miles beyond Uluru.
3. Extension of road from Gulyam to Moka beyond Moka to Rupanagudi.
4. Extension of the Goschen Bridge-Madehal road to Alur *via* Hattibelegal.
5. Completion of the road from Chintakunta to Bevinahal railway station and of the Yerur-Bantanahal Railway station road.
6. Bellary-Siddaragadda road.
7. Yemmiganur-Kampli road.

APPENDIX III-A.

[Vide answer to question No. 32 asked by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd August 1932, page 37 supra.]

Copy of letter from the Chairman, Municipal Council, Nandyal, G.O. No. 169/32, dated the 22nd July 1932.

The land alluded to was acquired at the cost of the Municipal fund in the year 1905.

The land was divided into 145 plots. They were brought to sale in the year 1924. One hundred and twelve plots were sold and the remaining 33 were left unsold for want of bidders. The sale fetched a sum of Rs. 30,625. Immediately after the sale, some purchasers filed a suit in the local District Munsif's Court questioning the right of the Municipality to sell the sites instead of assigning them free of cost. The matter was under protracted litigation. In consequence the Council was unable to realize the purchase money. In 1927, it had to file suits and obtain decrees for the recovery of the purchase money. Some of the decree amounts have been realized. Other decrees are still pending execution. The collections in each of the years from 1924–25 to 1931–32 are given below:—

	RS.	A.	P.
1924–25	1,361	4	0
1925–26	3,285	0	0
1926–27	...		
1927–28	1,032	8	0
1928–29	...		
1929–30	...		
1930–31	2,115	0	0
1931–32	5,758	1	0
	13,551	13	0

A sum of Rs. 2,465 was written off being irrecoverable. There still remains a balance of Rs. 14,886–2–0 to be realized.

[2nd August 1932

APPENDIX IV.

[*Vide* answer to question No. 33 asked by Mr. A. B. Shetty at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd August 1932, page 37 supra.]

Memorandum to the Chief Minister, the Government of Madras, presented at Madras on 21st March 1932 by Sir Alexander McDougall, Mr. G. L. Orchard, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, Lieut.-Col. C. H. Brock, Mr. W. W. Ladden, Major F. Church and Mr. J. N. Peyton representing Indian Roads and Transport Development Association, Ltd., the Madras Chamber of Commerce, the Southern India Chamber of Commerce, the United Planters' Association of Southern India, the Madras Trades Association, the Automobile Association of Southern India, and the Madras Motor Vehicles and Allied Merchants Association.

MOTOR TRANSPORT AND TAXATION.

Taxation on the motor transport industry is now higher in India than in any other part of the world, and it is higher in the Madras Presidency than in other parts of India. The extent of this taxation is not often realized and details will, therefore, be of interest.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT TAXES.

Cars, Lorris and Bus Chassis.—Import duty is now 37½ per cent *ad valorem* on private cars and 25 per cent on lorries and bus chassis.

Petrol.—The Import duty and Excise was increased by a further 2 annas per gallon last October and has now reached the astonishing total of 10 annas per gallon. On the current price for petrol, the levy is in excess of 100 per cent *ad valorem*. In Madras City the selling rate *ex* pump is Rs. 1–5–0 per gallon, calculated as follows:—

	RS.	A.	P.	
Net rate	0	9	0	per gallon.
Retailer's commission ...	0	2	0	,,
Government tax ...	0	10	0	,,
	1	5	0	,,

so that the price to the public is nearly 50 per cent tax.

Motor Oils.—The Import duty is now two annas one pie per gallon.

Tyres.—The Import duty is now 25 per cent *ad valorem*.

Accessories.—The Import duty varies from 25 per cent to 37½ per cent.

2nd August 1932]

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT TAXES.

Private Cars.—Registration fee Rs. 16 on purchase.

Annual Provincial tax under the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931:—

Weighing not more than 15 cwt. unladen	Rs.	70	per annum.
,, from 15 cwt. to 30 cwt. ...	,,	100	,,
,, from 30 ,, to 45 ,, ...	,,	130	,,
,, from 45 ,, to 60 ,, ...	,,	160	,,
,, over 60 ,, ...	,,	200	,,
Buses.—Registration fee	,,	16	on purchase.
Government permit	,,	16	per annum.
Brake testing fee	,,	50	,,

Annual Provincial Tax under the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, Rs. 920 per annum. (By a concession of the Madras Government Rs. 690 only was collected in 1931–32.)

DISTRICT BOARD TAXES.

Private cars are exempted. The taxes collected as licence fees on buses differ in the various districts, but Rs. 1,100 per annum per bus represents the average figure.

In order to realize the full burden of this taxation it is necessary to examine the running expenses of a bus and a private car owner and the figures set out below give a fair indication of annual costs:—

Bus—

	Total cost per annum.		Taxation per annum.	
	RS.	A.	RS.	A.
Initial cost of bus at Rs. 3,500 to be written off in three years—Duty at Rs. 650	1,166	0	216	0
Registration Rs. 16	5	5	5	5
Government permit	16	0	16	0
Brake testing fee	50	0	50	0
Provincial tax	690	0	690	0
District Board Licence fee	1,100	0	1,100	0
2,400 gallons of petrol per annum at an average of Rs. 1–9–0 per gallon	3,750	0	1,500	0
Motor oil	216	0	9	6
12 new tyres and 6 inner tubes ...	960	0	178	0
Spare parts	300	0	37	0
	8,253	5	3,801	11

In addition the bus owner must pay wages if he or members of his family do not act as driver and conductor. In the case of a bus owner operating on a large scale he must pay wages for his staff, and if he makes

[2nd August 1932

sufficient profit, a further levy is imposed upon him in the form of income and profession tax; thereby making a further contribution to the general revenue part of which is used for the upkeep of the roads.

Private car (15 to 30 cwt.)—

	Total cost per annum.		Taxation per annum.	
	RS.	A.	RS.	A.
Initial cost of car Rs. 4,000 to be written off in five years—Duty at Rs. 1,025	800	0	205	0
Registration at Rs. 16 on purchase.	3	3	3	3
Provincial tax under Madras Motor Vehicles Act, 1931	100	0	100	0
500 gallons of petrol per annum at an average of Rs. 1–9–0 per gallon	781	0	312	0
Motor oil	60	0	1	9
4 new tyres and 4 inner tubes ...	180	0	32	0
Spare parts	300	0	55	0
Wages	250	0	...	
	2,474	3	708	12

Thus *a private car owner spends approximately* Rs. 2,474 per annum on his car and out of this amount he contributes no less than Rs. 708 in *taxation, or 29 per cent. The burden of the bus owner is, however,* staggering. Out of a total expenditure of about Rs. 8,253 he contributes Rs. 3,802 in taxation or approximately 46 per cent of the whole. Out of every rupee which he spends, 7·36 annas is taxation.

It is of course well known how this state of affairs has arisen. In past years the motor transport trade has given an impression of false prosperity and all taxation authorities from the Central Government to the district boards in their search for means of raising revenue have imposed increasingly heavier taxes. There would appear to have been little co-operation between the authorities concerned and no effort made to ascertain the economic limit of taxation. There is some doubt regarding the total number of buses in the Madras Presidency, but the latest figures indicate that there are about four thousands owned by, say, 3,000 individuals. It is not equitable that this small group of 3,000 should be expected to contribute about 152 lakhs of rupees in taxation.

The present position of the bus industry has been described fully in the Legislative Council, in the petitions which have been presented to Government and in the Press. Buses are being withdrawn from the road in large numbers as their owners have come to the end of their resources, while those still in operation are running at a loss. Many of the poorer owners are only enabled to continue their business by obtaining an extension of their hire-purchase terms and through the generous credit

terms given by the petrol retailers. A large proportion of the bus business is thus being carried by the firms financing hire-purchase and by the petrol trade. This state of affairs cannot continue and a crisis in the trade is rapidly approaching. The sale of new buses is at a standstill. The sale of tyres and accessories has declined heavily. The sale of petrol which has increased every year since 1923 fell in 1931 for the first time. It is a significant fact that the drop in the petrol trade followed immediately the imposition of an additional 2 annas on the petrol Excise duty and the introduction of the Madras Motor Vehicles Act in April last year. With a further addition of 2 annas in the Excise duty in October the decline in petrol sales was accelerated. Thus while trade generally is improving in the Presidency and showing distinct signs of revival the position of the motor transport trade becomes steadily worse. The final result can only be an enormous reduction in the number of buses on the road and the ruin of all the small owners. The small bus owner has played a great part in providing quick and cheap communications in rural districts, and if he has himself profited, his enterprise has at the same time conferred great benefit on the community. It is neither just nor expedient to tax him out of existence.

It is not generally realized that the bus trade consumes approximately 80 per cent of the total sales of petrol. The partial extinction of the bus trade will, therefore, mean an enormous loss of revenue to the Central Government who now derive 10 annas on every gallon sold. The Provincial Government will suffer a corresponding loss as 20 per cent of this amount is allocated to the Provinces for road construction. There will be a further heavy drop in the receipts from import duty on new cars, and a loss in revenue on the collection under the Madras Motor Vehicles Act and the District Board Licence fees. The facts are perfectly plain. Three taxing authorities at the same time and acting independently have seen fit to bring about a drastic increase in the taxation on a particular Industry and the ruin of that Industry is the result. The responsibility must be shared by the Central Government, the Provincial Government and the District Boards, and it is essential that these bodies should act together to reduce the burden of taxation.

With regard to the petrol Excise duty of 10 annas a gallon it is necessary that either the Central Government should be prepared to reduce the Excise or else allocate to the Provinces a far larger proportion of the amount collected, so as to enable these authorities to reduce their direct taxation, or to make such grants to the District Boards as will enable them to reduce their licence fees.

The drastic amendment of the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, is also essential, as it is now obvious that this Act has failed completely to bring about its original objects.

It is understood that in introducing the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act of 1931 it was the intention of the Government of Madras to encourage the development of the industry by the abolition of tolls. The Indian Road Development Committee rightly condemned the system of tolls and the Madras Government accepted their recommendation to

[2nd August 1932

abolish them. In their statement of objects and reasons the Government say "The Indian Road Development Committee have condemned the system of tolls and it is considered necessary to terminate this system not only on account of the annoyance it causes to the road-using public and especially to fast-moving traffic, but to an even greater degree on account of its wastefulness as a method of collecting revenue from road-using vehicles. . . It is proposed, therefore, to abolish all tolls and to substitute vehicle taxation."

The system of tolls was based on the principle that the user of the road must pay for its use: so much so that it levied a toll on bullock carts and other vehicles that used the road. If a vehicle did not use certain roads, it paid no tolls. This older system of collection, based on a correct principle, was however, wrong in its application. In the attempt to effect a change in the collection of the dues, the Madras Motor Vehicles Act committed the error of losing sight entirely of the principle that the tax on vehicles is levied for the use of the road. The act provides for the taxation of all motor vehicles, some of which do not use public roads, and exempts from taxation vehicles such as bullock carts, bandies, etc. The exemption from tax of other vehicles other than motor vehicles has added an unfair burden to motor transport which has to make good the revenue lost by these exemptions.

The Government communique, dated 30th March 1931, published for the purpose of helping the public readily to acquaint themselves with the provisions of the Act, puts the proposition clearly and emphatically and in italics: "The vehicle need not be actually used; even if it is merely to be kept, the tax is to be paid." The same communique says that the effect of the Act is that carts kept outside the Municipal or Corporation limits are to pay no tax, and are not liable to pay any tolls even though they enter the Municipal limits and use the roads. It is wrong in principle to exempt from taxation the road-wearing bullock carts and bandies. It has been stated that the exemption of bullock carts, etc., from taxation is to the benefit of agriculture. Such an argument is not equitable by reason of the fact that motor trucks used solely for agricultural purposes are not exempt under the Act.

The Motor Vehicles Taxation Act leaves untouched the provisions of the Madras Local Boards Act and the District Municipalities Act which prohibit the use of motor vehicles and motor lorries for hire on any public road within the jurisdiction of the Local Bodies except on a Licence obtainable from the Chairman of the Municipality or the President of the District Board. These bodies have chosen to levy fees which though termed licence fees, are, in reality, taxes. The preamble to the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act states clearly that it was passed because it was "expedient to abolish the levy of tolls on motor vehicles by Local Bodies within the Madras Presidency." But the Act is defeated by the power of the Local Bodies to levy licence fees under the District Municipalities Act and the Local Boards Act.

It is recognized throughout the world that a licence fee is a collection solely for the purpose of meeting the expenses of supervision. The

2nd August 1932]

Act, by virtue of its preamble, clearly shows that its original intention was that it should be the sole tax on motor transport, and that in addition licences of a small amount only should be levied by District Boards to cover the cost of supervision and control of motor transport plying for hire in their respective districts.

The necessity of revising the Madras Local Boards Act and the District Municipalities Act has been clearly shown by the judgments delivered on the 14th March by Mr. Justice Waller and Mr. Justice Krishnan Pandalai in the recent Criminal appeal case, The Malabar District Board *v.* various bus owners. The latter had appealed against a conviction in Malabar for failure to pay District Board Licence fees on the grounds that such licence fees were in actual fact taxes and therefore illegal. The learned judges, were, however, unable to agree on this point and the case has been referred to a third judge.

The hard fact remains, however, that revenue must be raised, and it is agreed that the Motor Transport Industry must bear its share—but no more than its just share. It is admitted that the industry is now being treated with grave injustice, and also that at present excessive taxation is defeating its object by strangling motor transport. The result can only be a diminution of revenue.

Experience has shown in all countries that a reasonable tax on petrol is probably the most equitable—the present tax is unreasonable in amount and disposal. The petrol tax is carried by the consumer throughout the year, and therefore, causes the minimum disturbance to his business. Much of the present difficulty of the Madras bus owner can be attributed to the necessity of finding large sums quarterly or half-yearly to meet the Provincial Tax and District Board licence fees. But the Central Government now retains 80 per cent of the petrol tax, and if the whole of this vast sum was passed on to the Provincial Governments and utilized in part for grants to the District Boards the position would be greatly improved. If, however, it is impossible for the Central Government to relinquish their share of the petrol tax, the Provincial Government must turn to other sources of revenue. The most destructive vehicle on the road is the bullock cart, yet it pays nothing towards the upkeep of the roads. The solution therefore is to tax all vehicles on the road. This is both just and expedient. Even if this involves the re-establishment of tolls for non-mechanical transport, it would be preferable to the present state of affairs.

The Motor Transport Industry is now at the mercy of three taxing authorities. Co-ordination and a uniform policy is essential. A central authority should be established either Provincial or for all India, and a progressive policy initiated to encourage Motor Transport. Road Transport is less developed in India than in almost any country of the world and its potentialities are enormous. The only solution is a wholesale reduction in taxation and a vigorous policy of expansion.

Meanwhile to provide immediate relief, the following adjustment should be made in the present scale of taxes and licence fees.

The Provincial tax should be reduced to Rs. 5 per seat excluding driver and conductor per quarter.

District Board Licence fees should be limited to a maximum not exceeding Rs. 5 per seat per quarter.

Both tax and licence fee should be collected quarterly, Provincial tax on the 1st January, 1st April, 1st July and 1st October and District Board licence fees on the 1st February, 1st May, 1st August and the 1st November. This arrangement will spread the incidence as much as possible.

A bus owner taking out a licence or paying Provincial tax in the last month of any quarter should be permitted to pay two-fifths of the quarter tax or licence fee.

District Boards should be granted power to levy a tax on bullock carts and other users of their roads. If no other local means of obtaining revenue from bullock carts and other non-mechanical vehicles can be devised, each vehicle should be registered and numbered on similar lines as those adopted for cars, buses and lorries at a suitable registration fee. The Police should be given powers to stop any unregistered vehicle of all types.

The Provincial Government should take immediately steps to press upon the Central Government the equity of their claim to a larger proportion of the duty/excise on petrol and import duties on motor vehicles parts and accessories to be applied to the reduction of Provincial and Local Taxation of motor vehicles and the construction and maintenance of roads in the Presidency.

APPENDIX V.

[Vide answer to question No. 35 asked by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd August 1932, page 38 supra.]

Statement.

Districts in which Temple Committees are not functioning at present.

Name of district.	Date of expiry of the term of the Committee.
1. Anantapur	20— 5—30
2. Arcot, North	10—12—30
3. Bellary	6—10—30
4. Chingleput—	
Chingleput Circle Committee	27— 5—30
Tiruvallur Circle Committee	17— 6—30
5. Chittoor	10— 6—30

Name of district.	Date of expiry of the term of the Committee.
6. Coimbatore—	
Erode Circle Committee	5— 5—31
Coimbatore Circle Committee	18— 8—31
7. Cuddapah	12— 3—30
8. Ganjam	1—10—30
9. East Godavari	16— 9—30
10. West Godavari	13— 8—30
11. Guntur	8—10—30
12. Kistna	18— 2—31
13. Kurnool	14—10—30
14. * Madura—	
Palni Circle Committee	30— 6—29
Madura Circle Committee	20— 8—29
Periyakulam Circle Committee ...	20— 8—29
15. Nellore	2— 9—30
16. Nilgiris	19— 5—31
17. Ramnad	25— 2—31
18. Salem—	
Salem Circle Committee	15— 4—30
Tiruchengodu Circle Committee ...	29— 4—30
Dharmapuri Circle Committee	15— 4—30
19. South Kanara	7— 5—31
20. Trichinopoly—	
Trichinopoly Circle Committee ...	25— 3—31
Turaiyur Circle Committee	25— 3—31
Ariyalur Circle Committee	25— 3—31
21. Vizagapatam	12— 8—30
22. Malabar (no committee has been constituted for this district until now).	

APPENDIX VI.

[Vide answer to question No. 42 asked by Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd August 1932, page 44 supra.]

Press Communiqué of the Government of Madras, Revenue Department, dated Stonehouse Hill, the 29th June 1932.

In December last, the Collector of Bellary reported that, owing to lack of rain in Bellary taluk, a failure of crops was apprehended and that in many villages labourers were migrating in search of employment.

---

* The Madura Sri Minakshi Sundareswarar Devasthanam and its allied institutions are under the jurisdiction of a separate temple committee which is functioning.

[2nd August 1932

The Collector recommended that road works should be started to provide employment for unskilled labour; and the Government sanctioned a grant of Rs. 20,000 for the formation of a road from Kurugodu to Emmiganur. Subsequently it was found that similar conditions prevailed in parts of Siruguppa, Alur, Rayadrug and Hospet taluks, and nine other road works and thirteen water-supply works were started. The Government made grants to the District Board, Bellary, and Taluk Board, Adoni, covering almost the whole estimated cost of the works. The *special grants sanctioned by the Government amounted to* Rs. 1,80,000.

2. The kist season had meanwhile begun. Arrears of land revenue of three previous faslis (1338—1340) were outstanding in many villages of Bellary, Siruguppa, Alur and Rayadrug taluks, the collection having been postponed owing to unfavourable seasons in those years. It was clear that concessions would be necessary again this fasli. The local officers carefully inspected the areas affected, and the Government accepted the recommendations of the Collector and Board of Revenue for the remission or further postponement of the arrears, and also for the remission or postponement of a great part of the demand of the current fasli. The amount remitted outright in these areas is nearly 4½ lakhs of rupees, and the amount, the collection of which has been suspended till next year, is more than Rs. 2½ lakhs.

3. In addition to these reliefs, the Government decided to postpone the collection in the area affected of instalments of loans granted under the Loans Acts which were due in the current fasli. The amount of these dues is nearly 4¼ lakhs of rupees. In 1930 the loans granted in many villages of the district were treated as having been made free of interest and the interest previously collected was credited towards the principal. Proposals for extending this concession to five additional villages are under consideration.

4. Towards the end of April, proposals for starting new works to provide employment for unskilled labourers were being received. The Government, having regard to the large sums already spent for the purpose out of general revenues, and the sacrifice of a great part of the amounts payable by the ryots as land revenue and repayment of loans, considered that before further expenditure was sanctioned, the report contemplated by section 46 (*a*) of the Famine Code should be obtained on the economic condition of the tract affected, and the probable intensity and duration of distress. The Government, on considering that report and obtaining information as to the system of work, the tasks imposed, and the wages paid on the works which were being carried out by the local boards from the special grants sanctioned by the Government, found that the tasks were lighter and the wages higher than those laid down in the Famine Code for relief works. They therefore decided that the expenditure from Government revenues of further sums which might run into lakhs of rupees on works devised for the prevention of distress could not be justified unless proofs were forthcoming that the conditions prevailing were such as to warrant a declaration that relief should

2nd August 1932]

be administered in the manner prescribed in the Famine Code. The procedure laid down for ascertaining the existence of such conditions is the opening of " test works "—i.e., works run in a manner calculated to test whether a considerable number of persons would be willing to work for a bare subsistence. Accordingly five works were selected as " test works." These were opened under the administration of the Collector at the beginning of June: two more test works have since been sanctioned. The remaining local board works were shut down until the result of the test should be ascertained. The wages to be paid on these test works were those laid down in the Famine Code, with the addition of 25 per cent which was specially sanctioned because the fall in the price of condiments had not been so great as that in the price of grain. By the grant of a permanent advance the Collector was provided with unlimited funds for the purpose of running the works. The District Board Engineer was relieved of other duties and placed in charge of the works, and a special staff was sanctioned for supervising the payments.

5. In the " test " stage of famine operations, gratuitous relief may not be given to the dependants of workers. As regards others, the Government considered the question whether, along with the opening of the test works, it was necessary to make provision for the distribution of gratuitous relief in the form of food or money to destitute persons incapable of work. The Collector and the Settlement Commissioner agreed in reporting that the physical condition of the people was good, and that emaciation was not observed: and the Government therefore decided that no gratuitous relief need for the present be distributed. The Collector has, however, been informed that if he considers it necessary to adopt any such measures he may report the facts for the orders of the Government.

6. The number of persons employed by the local boards on the works under their charge had in May risen to nearly 20,000. When test-works were introduced the number fell, but rose later and on June 24th stood at over 14,000. It is ordinarily contemplated that test-works shall remain open only for a few weeks: but the Government have been unable to decide on the need for relief-works as soon as they had hoped, because it was found that the wages payable on the test-works were being supplemented in an unauthorized manner. They have therefore been compelled to continue the test, with conditions strictly limited to those which had been ordered; and the present position is that they are observing the result in order to decide at the earliest possible moment whether relief-works should be opened.

J. A. Thorne,
Secretary to Government

APPENDIX VII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 99 supra.]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

MEMORANDUM.

[Irrigation—(Guntur)—Repalle taluk—Higher falling shutters to the Kistna anicut—Introduction—Extent of dry lands unfit for wet cultivation.]

At the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 3rd November 1931, M.R.Ry. *G. Simhachalam Avargal*, M.L.C., enquired

(*a*) what the extent of dry lands was in the year immediately preceding the introduction of the increased shutters to the Kistna anicut, held by the ryots in the Repalle taluk, Guntur district, which were unfit for dry cultivation and useless to those ryots unless brought under irrigation;

(*b*) how much of that extent had been sanctioned for irrigation since then;

(*c*) how much of it was still lying waste;

(*d*) what the reason for not extending the benefit of irrigation to those lands was; and

(*e*) whether the Government were aware that most of these lands were lands situated at the tail-ends of irrigation canals, and could easily be irrigated with much less water than elsewhere and with no additional cost to them.

The hon. the Revenue Member stated in reply that a report had been called for and undertook to consider the question of placing the report on the table of the House when it was received. The report has been received and the particulars required are given below:—

	ACS.
(1) Extent of dry lands in the delta tracts of Repalle taluk, which were not cultivated with 'dry' crops in the year immediately preceding the introduction of 6 feet shutters at Kistna anicut	26,075
(2) Extent of dry lands in item (1) for which irrigation has been sanctioned since then.	12,087
(3) Remainder	13,988

The lands which might be brought under irrigation are scattered and would come under various channels. The question of arranging for their irrigation is engaging the attention of the Public Works Department.

J. A. THORNE,
Secretary to Government.

21st March 1932.

APPENDIX VIII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 99 supra.]

PUBLIC (SERVICES) DEPARTMENT.

COMMUNICATION TO THE COUNCIL.

With reference to the supplementary answer given to question No. 774, asked at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 28th January 1932, the following information is laid on the table:—

Legislative Council question No. 774 answered on 28th January 1932.

No Europeans were sent abroad during the triennium ending with the 31st December 1931 with State aid or scholarships for special study.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

APPENDIX IX.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 99 supra.]

A SURVEY OF THE FLOODS WHICH OCCURRED IN THE GANJAM, VIZAGAPATAM AND WEST GODAVARI DISTRICTS IN OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER 1931.

Origin and course of the storm.—Following upon disturbed weather conditions, a storm developed on the morning of the 13th October 1931 about 60 miles east of Calingapatam. It crossed the coast on 14th October 1931 and caused widespread rain in the North Madras Coast. In the Ganjam district the rains were unusually heavy in the basin of the Nagavalli river and the southern and western parts of the Chicacole taluk. In the Vizagapatam district the rainfall was unprecedentedly heavy on the 13th, 14th and 15th. The rainfall recorded on the 14th was 21·50 inches at Pottanghi, 14·10 inches at Vizianagram, 13·94 inches at Chipurapalle and between 10 and 11 inches at Srungavarapukota, Bimlipatam, Bobbili and Salur. On the 31st October and the 1st November 1931, there was again heavy rainfall throughout Vizagapatam district. In the West Godavari district also there were heavy rains towards the end of October and the beginning of November. Owing to the heavy rainfall many of the rivers and drains in the three districts were in floods during the period.

In the Ganjam district, the floods spread over an area 3 miles in width and over 16 miles in length all along the Nagavalli river from Kottavalasa to Mufusbundar.

In Vizagapatam, nine taluks in the plains and four in the Agency were affected by the floods. Almost all the rivers and streams in this area were in full floods. On account of the heavy rain the soil round the roots of trees on the slopes of hills in Pottanghi and Padwa taluks became soaked and trees fell and started an avalanche of mud and boulders which poured down the hill sides. There seem to have been some hundreds of these landslips and the total number of villages damaged in the Vizagapatam district was 228.

In the West Godavari district the drains in the Bhimavaram, Tadepalligudem and Ellore taluks overflowed submerging the low-lying tracts of the three taluks. All the drains fall into the Colair; the floods in the Colair were the highest received since 1917.

2. *Damage—(a) Loss of life—Ganjam.*—So far as information is available, only two lives were lost and one person is reported to be missing.

Vizagapatam.—The total number of lives lost was 333. There were 214 deaths in Pottanghi and Padwa taluks alone, mostly due to landslips which overwhelmed small villages at the foot of the hills.

West Godavari.—There was no loss of human life.

(b) Loss of livestock—Ganjam.—There has been some loss but the number has not been reported.

Vizagapatam.—The number of bulls, cows, goats, sheep and pigs lost is about 6,300.

West Godavari.—Some cattle-sheds collapsed and four head of cattle were lost.

(c) Loss of and damage to houses and other private property—Ganjam.—One thousand eight hundred and sixty-six houses were ruined and the occupants were rendered homeless.

Vizagapatam.—The number of families rendered homeless was 4,679.

West Godavari.—In the Ellore taluk, 669 houses were affected in the villages round the Colair in the Ellore taluk. Of these seventeen collapsed, and the rest were vacated on account of water in them. Two hundred and fifteen houses in Bhimadole village collapsed. About 200 huts were damaged in the Colair villages of the Bhimavaram taluk.

(d) Destruction and damage to cultivation—Ganjam.—The crop on about 150 acres of land was lost. A small area has also been covered with sand or eroded.

Vizagapatam—Plains.—About 3,700 acres of cultivated land were submerged or otherwise damaged. The area covered with sand is about 200 acres. The total loss of crops is estimated at Rs. 1,50,000.

Agency.—There was not much damage to crops and fields in Pottanghi taluk. In Padwa taluk several fields cultivated with jholla were heavily inundated and in some villages many paddy fields were covered with sand and boulders which not only destroyed the crop but

also rendered the land permanently unfit for cultivation. Roughly a tenth of the wet paddy in the taluk was spoiled. In Jeypore taluk, all the fields bordering on the Kolab river in 26 villages near Kotta were damaged or silted up. The loss in Malkangiri taluk was considerable. Ragi, cholam, chillies and paddy were completely washed away or considerably ruined in the villages affected. Much land was also silted up.

West Godavari.—The wet crops on about 22,350 acres in Bhimavaram taluk, 2,000 acres in Tadepalligudem taluk and 24,010 acres in Ellore taluk are reported to have been affected. The area silted up is insignificant.

(*e*) *Damage to Government property other than irrigation works—Ganjam*.—The wall of the District Munsif's Court, Chicacole, was damaged. The repair is estimated to cost Rs. 680.

Vizagapatam—Plains.—Considerable damage has been caused to cattle-pounds in Salur, Bobbili, Palakonda and Vizianagram taluks. One cattle-pound in Bobbili taluk was washed away. In the Anakapalle taluk, portions of the compound walls behind the Taluk office and the Sub-Registrar's office had to be pulled down to facilitate the discharge of flood water. The Police lines at Sitanagram were slightly damaged. A dozen village-sites were badly silted up in Palakonda taluk. The village records and the survey instruments of Mugguru were carried away by the Nagavalli; some of the records were, however, recovered later in Chicacole. The village records of five villages in the Vizianagram taluk were either washed away or damaged.

Agency.—In the Malkangiri taluk the rest-house at Kondakamberu washed away and the cattle-pound at Motu was damaged. Some of the Police huts at Padwa were slightly affected. Except the damage to the Itikavalasa-Jeypore road and the bridge over the Kolab river, no serious damage was done to Government buildings and roads. The road from Salur to Jeypore was repaired and made fit for through light motor traffic by about the middle of November 1931.

(*f*) *Damage to irrigation works—Ganjam*.—The estimate of damage done to minor irrigation works is Rs. 7,500.

In the Ganjam minor rivers system there were six breaches in the channels taking off from the Langulya river and the Girisola channel was slightly silted up in places. There was some damage to the tanks, canals and channels in the Rushikulya system. The total cost of repairing the damage is estimated at about Rs. 25,500.

Vizagapatam.—Seventy irrigation works including tanks were damaged. The repairs are estimated to cost Rs. 23,000.

There were abnormal floods in the Sarada river which caused eight breaches. The urgent repairs required for the irrigation of standing crops were put in hand. The bank of the Kondakerla Ava breached in four places; arrangements were made immediately to close the breaches to hold water for second crop.

In the Parvatipur subdivision, nine river channels and ten tanks were affected though not severely. In the Nagavalli irrigation system, there were minor breaches and erosions in the channels and distributaries but these were closed and normal flow in the main channel was kept up.

The total cost of repairing the damage to Public Works Department irrigation works in the district is estimated at Rs. 69,000.

West Godavari.—A big breach was caused in the right bank of the Yanamaduru drain in Bhimavaram taluk and breaches also occurred in the bunds of six irrigation tanks in the district.

There was very little damage to major irrigation works. The cost of repairing the small damage and closing a few breaches is estimated at Rs. 5,000.

(*g*) *Damage to communications—Ganjam.*—The Great Northern Trunk Road, the Chicacole-Calingapatam road, the Srikurmam road, the Chicacole-Palakonda road and some village roads were damaged. The cost of repairs to the first four roads is estimated at Rs. 17,000. The Ganjam District Board is taking steps to repair the damage and the question of affording relief to the District Board by way of grants for this purpose is under the consideration of Government. A grant of Rs. 3,090 has also been sanctioned towards the cost of repairs to roads in the Anakapalle Municipality.

Vizagapatam—Agency.—Roads and bridges were badly affected. In the Pottanghi taluk the foot bridge at Pithaguda over the Upper Kolab, another bridge on the Turner's Ghaut Road near Pottanghi, the Public Works Department bridge at Doliamba, and both approaches to the bridge at Sunki were washed away. The Itikavalasa-Pottanghi Ghaut Road and the approaches to the Tuba and Cyaliput culverts on the Sembliguda-Padwa Road were also damaged. In the Padwa taluk, the Anantagiri Ghaut Road was badly damaged and practically every large culvert on the Padwa-Minimulur Road was washed away. The road to a length of about 200 yards on the tank-bund near Salimi and the wooden bridge over the Saptadhara river in the Malkangiri taluk were also washed away.

Vizagapatam—Plains.—The cost of repairs to the trunk and second-class roads in the district is estimated at Rs. 1·4 lakhs and 2·4 lakhs respectively. The District Board has been authorized to proceed with the repairs in anticipation of assistance from Provincial funds.

West Godavari.—The masonry drainage sluice of the C.A.D. Corporation was completely washed away. A breach, about fifty feet in length, occurred in the Great Northern Trunk Road near Bhimadole in Ellore taluk.

3. *Measures of relief—Ganjam.*—The Government sanctioned an amount of Rs. 2,000 for the relief of distress. A flood relief committee was formed under the instructions and guidance of the Collector and it was able to raise public subscriptions amounting to Rs. 4,000. The

2nd August 1932]

District Board, the Taluk Board, Chicacole, and the Chicacole Municipality contributed Rs. 1,000 each. A sum of Rs. 2,000 was distributed immediately to the deserving poor.

Vizagapatam—Agency.—Practically nothing could be done in the Agency taluks of Padwa, Pottanghi, Malkangiri and Jeypore, to mitigate the effects of the floods as they rose and passed away within 24 hours. The whole damage in Pottanghi taluk is said to have been done in 15 minutes. Some villagers who were surrounded by floods in Chalanaput village were rescued with the help of elephants lent by the Jeypore Estate. The Estate offered loans of paddy in Pottanghi and Padwa taluks. The plying of boats by a boat contractor of the Baster States considerably helped the rescue work at Motu.

Plains.—Palkonda was the only taluk where nothing could be done as the rivers came down suddenly in floods. Elsewhere everything which could be done to mitigate the effects of the floods was carried out with foresight and promptness. In Anakapalle taluk, the road near the local fund bridge was cut in three places in order to facilitate the discharge of the flood water. The people in the locality were induced to leave their houses with their chattels and live-stock in good time. Currency notes, opium, stamps and other valuables kept in the sub-treasury were secured on the record racks of the Taluk office. As already mentioned the compound walls behind the Taluk office and the Sub-Registrar's office were pulled down to ensure the free and rapid discharge of flood water. The river embankment was strengthened in several places to prevent breaches.

The Government sanctioned Rs. 10,000 towards the relief of distress in the district. A sum of about Rs. 7,500 was placed at the disposal of the subordinate officers for making small cash grants to the destitute for the purchase of food and clothing. Proposals for the grant of relief to an extent of Rs. 2,400 are under scrutiny. Relief committees were formed and grain and building material were granted freely, the latter from Government porambokes where available.

West Godavari.—The immediate relief required was the provision of shelter to the people who were rendered homeless. The Collector granted free of cost 215 palmyra trees standing on Government porambokes to the people in Bhimadole whose houses had collapsed. Free grants of trees and leaves were made to the poor people in the villages round the Colair and steps are being taken to provide water for the second-crop irrigation inasmuch of the affected area as possible.

4. *Repair of irrigation works—Ganjam.*—Six estimates for the repair of damaged tanks have been submitted to the Collector for sanction. There are enough funds to carry out the works.

Vizagapatam.—In the Salur taluk, almost all the minor breaches in the tanks have been closed by the ryots concerned, and the big breaches also have been temporarily repaired by them. In the Bobbili taluk, the villagers have temporarily closed the breaches in tanks in

all the villages affected except Lingamvalasa. In this village the breaches in the minor irrigation tanks have been closed temporarily by the village headman at small cost.

In the Sarvasiddhi taluk, three breaches in the Babakhan channel and three in the Goparaju channel have been closed by the ryots. In the Viravilli taluk, one breach in the Lakshmipuram big tank was repaired by the estate, but the tank breached again later owing to the heavy rain on 31st October 1931.

In the Palkonda taluk, ten breaches in minor irrigation tank bunds have been closed by the ryots concerned, and in the Vizianagram taluk temporary repairs have been executed to the tanks in four villages by private individuals.

West Godavari.—In Tadepalligudem taluk, the breaches in a small minor irrigation tank of Ungutur and Vadupu tank of Tadepalli were immediately closed by the ryots. A temporary ring bund was formed by the ryots to prevent damage by the breaching of the Velagalamma tank of Kuchanpudi. The breaches in the Idula cheruvu, Ura cheruvu and Timmanna cheruvu also were closed by the ryots.

Repairs to minor irrigation works in the charge of the Revenue Department in all the three districts have either already been carried out or are in progress and will be completed shortly. It is expected that the repairs to the irrigation works in the charge of the Public Works Department will be completed before the next irrigation season.

5. *Assistance towards economic reconstruction—Ganjam.*—The Collector reports that an amount of Rs. 10,000 is likely to be required under the Land Improvement and Agriculturists' Loans Acts to give relief to cultivators whose lands have been covered with sand and who have lost their cattle. The amount will be sanctioned when needed.

Remission of revenue will be granted under the rules contained in Board's Standing Order No. 13. The amount of remission of revenue anticipated on account of flood damage is Rs. 15,000.

Vizagapatam.—Advances under the Loans Act will be granted where necessary. The possibility of forming co-operative societies for advancing loans to deserving persons for the construction of a better class of houses is being explored in the Vizianagram taluk. In the case of some of the villages affected by flood steps are being taken in consultation with the Vizianagram Estate to select new village-sites which will be less exposed to flood damage.

Remission of revenue will be granted under the provisions of Board's Standing Order No. 13. The amount to be remitted is estimated at Rs. 21,000.

West Godavari.—Remission of revenue was granted under the provisions of Board's Standing Order No. 13. The amount remitted exceeds Rs. 44,000.

2nd August 1932]

6. *Measures to prevent the recurrence of the floods or to mitigate their effects—Ganjam.*—The question of the formation of a flood bank for the Nagavalli is under correspondence between the Collector and the Executive Engineer. The Collector has been asked to obtain the opinion of the officers of the Public Works Department in regard to the necessity for a larger number of vents in the railway line between Dusi railway station and Kanugulavalasa village towards Chicacole road railway station.

Vizagapatam.—It seems that the podu cultivation in the hills of Madgole is the chief reason for the heavy floods in the Sarada river. The Collector is considering what steps should be taken to prevent the cutting of trees on the hill slopes. An estimate for providing more vents to the bridge on the road near Anakapalle is under consideration.

7. *General.*—The storm of the 13th-14th October was unprecedented. No such storm has been known in the Agency tracts within the memory of man. At the time of the deluge most of the tanks in the plains taluks of Vizagapatam were full owing to the rain in the latter part of September and early October and few could withstand the enormously increased supply. The fact that 45 Government tanks in Palkonda taluk were considerably affected in spite of expenditure regularly incurred upon maintenance shows that few tanks could have withstood the torrents of water poured into them. There is, however, no doubt that the unsatisfactory condition of many estate tanks to some extent contributed to the heaviness of the floods. So far as the Agency tracts are concerned, there appears to be nothing that can be done to mitigate the effects of such exceptional rainfall. The storm of the 13th-14th October although of great severity was fortunately not accompanied by wind and the weather became fine and dry after the storm had passed. The people who had been rendered homeless were thus spared further difficulties and fortunately there were no epidemics. The Government desire to record their appreciation of the good work done by officials and non-officials in relieving distress and repairing damage.

J. A. THORNE,
Secretary to Government.

APPENDIX X.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 99 supra.]

A SURVEY OF THE FLOODS WHICH OCCURRED IN THE TINNEVELLY, TRICHINOPOLY, TANJORE AND SOUTH ARCOT DISTRICTS IN DECEMBER 1931.

1. *Causes and extent of the floods.*—About the end of the first week of December 1931 a storm developed some distance off the Coromandel Coast and moving towards the Peninsula caused abnormal rainfall in

[2nd August 1932

some of the southern districts of the Presidency, mainly in South Arcot, Tanjore, Trichinopoly and Tinnevelly and between the 7th and 11th December. In the Tanjore district the rainfall continued with occasional breaks till the 28th December, the heaviest rainfall being recorded on the 23rd and 24th. There was also heavy rainfall in the South Arcot district during the last week of the month.

The maximum recorded in the Tinnevelly district was 7·87 inches on the 10th December. By 5-30 p.m. on that day the water in the Tambaraparni reached a height of 29 feet above the bed level in Tinnevelly town. There were a number of breaches in the river, the taluk that suffered worst in this respect being Srivaikuntam. Fortunately the floods began in daylight and precautions were taken to prevent any serious loss of life and destruction of movable property.

In the Tanjore district the rainfall recorded on the 24th was 9·35 inches at Tranquebar, 10·32 inches at Nannilam, 14·44 inches at Negapatam, 14·62 inches at Tiruppundi and 13·60 inches at Vedaranniyam. A number of breaches occurred in the rivers of the Vennar system. The rainfall was however confined to the delta and the uplands and the situation was fortunately not aggravated as in 1930 by rains in the basin of the Cauvery.

The area principally affected in the South Arcot district by the floods in the second week of December was Cuddalore town and the adjacent coastal area. The portion of the district to the south of the Pennar also suffered though less severely. The rains in the last week of December mainly affected Chidambaram taluk.

In the Trichinopoly district rainfall was particularly heavy in the taluks of Udaiyarpalaiyam, Kulittalai and Trichinopoly, the rainfall recorded on the 11th December 1931 being 9·44 inches at Ariyalur, 7·93 inches at Jayaukundam and 7·28 inches at Manapparai. There was also incessant rainfall on the 23rd and 24th December in the Udaiyarpalaiyam taluk. The damage in the district was however comparatively slight.

2. (a) *Loss of life.*—Fourteen lives were lost in Tinnevelly. A ferry-boat plying across the Vaippar at Vilattikulam in Koilpatti taluk overturned and was carried away by the flood. Ten out of 23 passengers in the boat lost their lives. The collapse of a house in Srivaikuntam taluk accounts for one death. A beggar jumped into the water from a mantapam near the Tambaraparni and was carried away by the flood. Two corpses were washed ashore at Tuticorin; they could not be identified.

One life was lost in Tiruturaipundi taluk (Tanjore district).

In South Arcot and Trichinopoly no lives were lost.

(b) *Loss of cattle—Tinnevelly.*—About 675 cattle were lost, including 595 in Srivaikuntam taluk.

Tanjore.—The number lost was about 342.

South Arcot and Trichinopoly.—No damage to livestock has been reported.

2nd August 1932]

(c) *Damage to houses—Tinnevelly.*—Five thousand one hundred and eighty-nine families were rendered homeless in the taluks of Ambasamudram, Srivaikuntam, Tinnevelly and Tiruchendur. The number in Srivaikuntam taluk alone is 4,013. The people affected were mostly labourers.

Tanjore.—The number of houses damaged is 1,234.

South Arcot.—The number of families rendered homeless was 140.

3. *Damage to property—(a) Government property—*(i) *Irrigation works—Tinnevelly.*—The damage to Public Works Department works was considerable in Marudur Kila Kal, North Main channel and in the left bank above and below the anicut in the Srivaikuntam taluk and in the Chittar channel system in Tinnevelly taluk.

In Srivaikuntam taluk, there were 20 breaches in the left flood bank of the Tambaraparni, three of them in the villages of Srivaikuntam, Valavallan and Inam Tiruppani Chettiapathu being large ones. The Marudur Kila Kal system breached in twelve places. The bunds of the North Main channel at Eral were washed away for a length of about two miles. Breaches occurred in both the old and the new flood-banks in Kilappidagai Appankoil and water entered the village to a height of 5½ feet. Thirteen tanks in the charge of the Public Works Department breached as a result of breaches in the flood-banks of the river. Eighteen breaches occurred in the Srivaikuntam Periyakulam tank.

In Tiruchendur taluk there was a small breach in the right flood-bank of the Tambaraparni. The flood-banks in Athinathapuram and Inam Sedukkuvaithan were eroded. There were three breaches in the Athur channel.

Two tanks in the Tinnevelly taluk breached on account of the heavy rains on the 10th November. The breaches have been closed.

The total extent of damages to Public Works Department works is estimated at Rs. 2,18,000.

As many as 143 minor irrigation works under the control of the Revenue Department were effected. The cost of closing the breaches is estimated at Rs. 25,000.

Tanjore.—The damage in the Cauvery system was not serious. The amount required for closing the breaches and repairing the flood damage is estimated at Rs. 7,200.

The damage in the Vennar system (as usual in a north-east monsoon flood) was more serious. In addition to scours and overwashings, many rivers in the system breached in several places. There were 73 breaches in all in the Vennar, Vettar, Vadavar, Odambokiyar, Korayar, Pamaniyar and Pandavayar and as many as 103 breaches in the Adappar. The Vedaranniyam canal breached in six places.

In the Pattukkottai taluk, breaches occurred in the Periyakottai and Olayakunnam tanks and the bunds of two tanks were badly eroded.

The cost of closing the breaches is estimated at Rs. 86,000.

The total number of minor irrigation works in the charge of the Revenue Department in which there were breaches is 57. The estimated cost of closing these breaches is Rs. 12,250.

South Arcot.—Breaches occurred in 12 tanks in the charge of the Public Works Department and in 41 minor irrigation tanks. There were also breaches in the Vadavar bank and the Budangudi channel in Chidambaram. The cost of repairs is estimated at Rs. 20,150.

Trichinopoly.—Two tanks and four major irrigation channels in the charge of the Public Works Department and 15 minor irrigation tanks breached. The cost of repairing the minor irrigation tanks has been estimated at Rs. 3,500.

(ii) *Other property—Tinnevelly.*—The loss on account of the collapse of compound walls, cattle-pounds and village chavadis is estimated at Rs. 500. In Tiruchendur taluk, paths under the control of Government and not vested in local boards have been badly scoured. The estimated cost of repair is Rs. 600.

Tanjore.—There was very little damage to Government property, but some roads were damaged in the Arantangi and Mayavaram taluks.

South Arcot and Trichinopoly.—No serious losses have been reported.

(*b*) *Private property*—(i) *Crops—Tinnevelly.*—An extent of 1,445 acres has been badly silted up in Srivaikuntam taluk and the cost of reclamation is estimated at Rs. 96,000. In addition, the standing crops on an extent of about 4,650 acres were damaged and ripe paddy crop was lost on account of submersion on an extent of 1,915 acres. In other taluks the damage was comparatively light. The total loss in the district on account of damage to standing crops is estimated at Rs. 1,31,000.

Tanjore.—The total extent on which the crops were spoiled is about 20,000 acres. The largest extent affected was in Tiruturaipundi taluk where the damage was extensive and serious.

The area silted up was however insignificant, being only 13 acres.

South Arcot.—Crops on about 200 acres in Chidambaram taluk were destroyed by submersion. Paddy and sugarcane were affected to some extent in Chidambaram and Cuddalore taluks, but the outturn has been fair.

Trichinopoly.—About 3,000 acres of wet land in Kulittalai, Trichinopoly and Udaiyarpalaiyam taluks were submerged, but as there was no rainfall after the 11th, water drained away quickly and no great damage was caused. The area silted up is 30·31 acres.

(ii) *Other property—Tinnevelly.*—The damage to houses is estimated at Rs. 1,90,000.

South Arcot.—Substantial houses did not suffer. A number of huts were affected.

2nd August 1932]

4. *Measures of immediate relief—Tinnevelly.*—A number of beggars were trapped in a mantapam some 70 yards from the bank of the Tambaraparni which became isolated owing to the rise of the water in the river. They were too far out for a rope to be thrown to them. There was no boat and a raft that was specially constructed could not reach them. Three men jumped into the river. Two were carried to safety and were rescued, but the third was drowned. The rest of the party spent the night on the roof of the mantapam and were rescued at 5 p.m. the next day.

Free grants of palmyras and forest minor produce for rebuilding houses were sanctioned to a number of homeless and deserving people in Srivaikuntam and Tinnevelly taluks. A sum of Rs. 269 was granted by the Collector to 68 persons, mostly women and men incapable of labour, to enable them to hire labour for rebuilding their houses. The Tahsildar of Srivaikuntam has laid out convenient plots on rising ground in Karungulam village for the people of Adithanallur village. A flood relief committee was formed at Srivaikuntam and a district flood relief fund has been opened. A variety entertainment was organized on 9th January 1932 in aid of the fund and a sum of about Rs. 850 was realized. The rebuilding of houses is proceeding rapidly.

Remission of land revenue will be granted under the rules in the Board's Standing Orders. The anticipated remission is Rs. 33,000.

Tanjore.—No measures were urgently needed. The owners of the houses which were destroyed or damaged by the floods have taken steps to reconstruct them. Loans under the Loans Acts will be given wherever necessary.

The anticipated remission of revenue is Rs. 76,694. The Government have sanctioned the following special concessions for lands on which a crop had not been harvested previously during the fasli in Tiruturaipundi taluk:—

(1) Remission of full assessment in the case of total loss of crop on a whole survey number or subdivision;

(2) remission of full assessment where the outturn is not in excess of two annas; and

(3) remission of a third of the demand where the outturn is above 2 annas and not more than 4 annas. The grant of similar concessions in Mannargudi and Nannilam taluks is under consideration.

South Arcot.—Twenty-one applications for loans for rebuilding houses were received and 10 loans covering an amount of Rs. 395 were granted up to 20th February 1932. Free grants of timber and leaves valued at Rs. 575 were made for the same purpose. The anticipated remission of revenue is Rs. 1,100.

Trichinopoly.—No measures of immediate relief were needed. The remission to be granted is estimated at Rs. 100 to Rs. 125.

[2nd August 1932

5. *Repair of irrigation works—Tinnevelly.*—The breaches in the minor irrigation tanks were closed temporarily by ring-bunds and water was stored for the standing crops. The minor irrigation staff is busy preparing estimates for repairs.

South Arcot.—Six branches in Tirukkoyilur and Cuddalore divisions and all the breaches in Chidambaram division except in the Vadavar were closed by the Government. The breaches in the Vadavar were closed by kudimaramat. Several breaches were also closed permanently or temporarily by private agency.

Trichinopoly.—Steps were taken to preserve water for the irrigation of standing crops by forming ring-bunds and closing breaches wherever possible.

The repairs to the irrigation works in the charge of both the Revenue and the Public Works Department will be carried out as early as possible.

6. *Restoration of communications—Tinnevelly.*—The portions of the roads in the municipalities of Palamcottah and Tinnevelly which were damaged have been temporarily repaired and restored for traffic. The District Board has sanctioned a sum of about Rs. 50,000 towards road repair works. The Local Fund Department is making rapid progress in the repair of roads in all parts of the district. The question of making a grant to the District Board for the repair of roads and bridges is under consideration.

Tanjore.—The Collector has addressed the District Board, Tanjore, and the Taluk Board, Mayavaram, in the matter of the rapid execution of necessary repairs.

General.—On the whole the flood damage in Tinnevelly was not widespread but intensive in a few villages. The district is subject to periodical floods in the Tambaraparni river. Loss of household property was mostly confined to villages situated within flood banks or in low-lying places, and the Collector is discouraging the re-occupation of such sites. The Public Works Department proposes to investigate the possibility of improving the mouth of the Tambaraparni into the sea and making it more efficient.

In Tanjore the floods were almost entirely due to local rainfall and were much less extensive than in 1930. A study of the statistics of rainfall at the various stations in the district is being made, with a view to considering to what extent the flood-banks in the Vennar system have to be further strengthened and raised.

Various measures have been taken in the past to mitigate the effects of the Gadilam floods in the South Arcot district and it is due to these measures that the floods resulting from the unprecedented rainfall of 20½ inches in 25 hours occasioned no loss of life and only slight damage to property. Only two areas were seriously submerged—(1) a group of villages including Sarvorajanpettai and Naduthittu and (2) the area round the village of Killai both in Chidambaram taluk. The latter is

2nd August 1932]

a low-lying flat area close to the coast and there seems to be no practicable remedy to prevent its being submerged in case of a heavy rainfall. The submersion of the former area was due partly to the failure of the ryots to repair the flood-bank of the Vellagal odai and partly to the obstruction of the course of the odai by the inadequate ventways in a local board bridge on the Edayur road. The questions of repairing the flood-bank and improving the bridge are engaging the attention of the Collector.

The Government desire to record their appreciation of the good work done by officials and non-officials in relieving distress and repairing damage.

J. A. THORNE,
Secretary to Government.

APPENDIX XI.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 99 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. NOTE No. 10392 A-2, DATED 19TH MAY 1932.

With reference to the answer given to Question No. 1056 in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932, the following information is laid on the table of the House:—

Legislative Council Question No. 1056.

1401 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that there was a lathi charge on peaceful Congress processionists in Rajapalayam on 13th February 1932; if so, how many were injured;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that they were treated in the local hospital; if so, whether the Government will be pleased to call for a copy of the accident register relating to their injuries;

(*c*) whether after the medical treatment was over the volunteers were taken from the hospital by the Police in a bus and left four miles north of Rajapalayam in a jungle;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that when about 8 p.m. they returned and were passing the Police station, the Circle Inspector of Police ordered them to run and on failure threatened to beat them;

(*e*) whether it is a fact that one Mr. I. B. Rangaswami Raju, who could not run owing to the severe injuries, was pulled and thrashed severely by the policemen till he became unconscious; and

(*f*) whether he was again treated by the local Government doctor; if so, whether the Government will be pleased to call for a statement from the doctor regarding the injuries, their number and nature.

A.—(*a*) On 13th February 1932, a batch of six volunteers took out a procession and collected a crowd. The assembly was declared unlawful and the processionists were asked to disperse. On their refusal, they were dispersed by force. Immediately after, another batch of seven volunteers took out a procession and on their refusal to disperse when ordered to do so they were dispersed by force. All the thirteen volunteers received simple injuries.

(*b*) Yes. As all the injuries were simple they were not entered in the accident register.

(*c*) Yes; but not in a jungle.

(*d*) The thirteen volunteers returned to Rajapalayam and with about a dozen more volunteers passed in procession in front of the Police station at about 7-15 p.m. shouting civil disobedience slogans. They refused to disperse when ordered to do so and were therefore dispersed by force.

(*e*) The volunteer in question received some cuts during the dispersal and fell to the ground. He was not pulled and thrashed by the police till he became unconscious.

(*f*) Yes. The doctor's report shows that the volunteer received about a dozen "bruised stripes" all of a simple nature on his back, thigh, arms, legs and ankles and that he was conscious.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

APPENDIX XII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 99 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 4196-3, dated 23rd May 1932.

With reference to the answer given to clause (*a*) of question No. 1252 in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932, the following additional information is laid on the table of the House:—

The total expenditure incurred on feeding the Police in South Kanara district on account of the civil disobedience movement up to the end of March 1932 is Rs. 1,863–10–3.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

2nd August 1932]

APPENDIX XIII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. NOTE No. 8836-2, DATED 23RD MAY 1932.

With reference to the answer given to question No. 1103 in the Legislative Council on the 23rd March 1932, the following information is placed on the table of the House:—

Q.—Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether on the evening of the 17th January 1932, Nagi Reddi was beaten in Pamarru with lathis for hoisting a national flag, and if so, why he was subjected to blows, without being placed before a Magistrate for trial for any offence he may have committed?

A.—No person by name Nagi Reddi was beaten by the Police on the 17th January 1932. One Tammareddi Nagareddi received some injuries on 15th January 1932 at Pamarru during the forcible dispersal of an unlawful assembly collected by him and others as a demonstration in connexion with the civil disobedience movement. It is not true that the man was beaten for hoisting a 'national' flag.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

APPENDIX XIV.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10280-2, dated the 23rd May 1932.

With reference to the answer to clauses (*c*) and (*d*) of question No. 1112 given in the Legislative Council on 24th March 1932, the following information is laid on the table of the House:—

(*c*) how long were these ladies (Srimathis A. Ushamani and T. Kousalya Devi) kept in the hospital as in-patients; and

(*d*) when were they discharged?

A.—(*c*) & (*d*) The two ladies were admitted into the hospital on 22nd February 1932 and discharged on 23rd February 1932.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

APPENDIX XV.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10353-2, *dated 25th May* 1932.

With reference to the answer given in the Legislative Council to Question No. 1057 on the 19th March 1932, the following information is laid on the table of the House:—

1057 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that A. V. Kunhambu and M. V. Chindan Nayar were taken to the Police station on their refusal to cease picketing Ramachandra Maliga & Son's cloth shop in Kasargod on 7th March 1932, and beaten by the Police with hands and canes and subsequently taken into the lock-up where they were beaten by the Sub-Inspector with cane and then pushed out;

(*b*) whether, when they again returned to picket, they were again taken to the station and similarly beaten by the Police and the Sub-Inspector;

(*c*) whether they were taken walking about 1 a.m. (after midnight) by the Police to a house about five miles away and then left there; and

(*d*) whether it is a fact that all the while they were made to starve?

A.—(*a*) The two persons were taken to the Police station as they refused to go away from the scene of picketing. On their giving a verbal undertaking not to picket again they were released. They were not beaten in the Police station. They were in fact detained in the Police station for only 15 minutes and were not put into the lock-up at all.

(*b*) In violation of their undertaking the two persons again picketed the same shop after release whereupon the Police arrested and took them to the station. They were not beaten by the Police. They were released again at about 7 p.m.

(*c*) On their release the two persons were allowed to go where they wished. They walked for about 4 miles and entered a private house.

(*d*) The two persons were in custody between the hours of 4-30 and 7 p.m. only. There was no need to provide food for them during this short period.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

2nd August 1932]

Appendix XVI.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

List of posts on Rs. 500 per mensem and above created during the quarter ending 31st March 1932.

A.—PERMANENT.

Nil.

B. TEMPORARY.

(i) Extension of previous sanction.

General Administration.

Department and designation of post.	Pay per mensem.	Period of tenure.	Remarks.
Public (Services) Department—			
	RS.		
Assistant Secretary, Law (Drafting).	500—50—800	For six months from 30th January 1932.	The post was sanctioned to relieve the Under Secretary, Law (Drafting) Department, for six months from 30th July 1931 and extended for six months up to 30th January 1932 and now further extended for six months.

Administration of Justice.

Department and designation of post.	Pay per mensem.	Period of tenure.	Remarks.
Law (General) Department—			
Additional Sub-Judge, Tanjore.	650	One year from 1st January 1932.	....
Additional District Munsif, Bellary.	Grade pay in the I.C.S.	One month from 1st March 1932.	For the judicial training of Mr. P. Rajagopalan, I.C.S.

(ii) Posts newly created.

General Administration.

Department and designation of post.	Pay per mensem.	Period of tenure.	Remarks.
Public (Services) Department—			
Additional Secretary to Government in the Chief Secretariat.	Pay in the senior scale of the I.C.S. plus Presidency Allowance of Rs. 100.	From 4th January 1932 to 20th March 1932.	Mr. T. G. Rutherford, I.C.S., was appointed to the post.
Public (Special) Department—			
Additional Under Secretary to Government in the Public Department.	Pay in the junior time-scale of the I.C.S. plus Rs. 200 Special pay.	From 12th January 1932 to 26th January 1932 (inclusive).	Mr. D. H. Elwin, I.C.S., was appointed to the post.
Officer on special duty in the Chief Secretariat.	Pay in the junior time-scale of the I.C.S.	From 19th February 1932 to 24th March 1932.	Mr. H. Trevelyan, I.C.S., was appointed to the special duty.

[2nd August 1932

B. TEMPORARY—*cont.*

(ii) POSTS NEWLY CREATED—*cont.*

General Administration—cont.

Department and designation of post.	Pay per mensem.	Period of tenure.	Remarks.
Public (Special) Department—			
	RS.		
Additional Under Secretary to Government in the Public Department.	Grade pay of a Deputy Collector plus Rs. 200 Special pay.	From 3rd March 1932 to 12th April 1932.	M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur A. A. Venkatarama Ayyar Avargal was appointed to the post.
Collector	2,750	From 20th January 1932 to 11th April 1932.	M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur U. Rama Rao Avargal was appointed to be on special duty as a nominated member of the Legislative Assembly.

Administration of Justice.

Department and designation of post.	Pay per mensem.	Period of tenure.	Remarks.
Public (Special) Department—			
Additional District and Sessions Judge, Guntur.	Pay in the senior time-scale of the I.C.S.	From 15th January 1932 to 8th April 1932.	Mr. A. S. Panchapagesa Ayyar, I.C.S., was appointed to the post.
Additional Sessions Judge, East Godavari.	Do.	From 1st February 1932 to 29th February 1932.	M.R.Ry. T. Bhujanga Rao Avargal was appointed to the post.

Civil works.

Department and designation of post.	Pay per mensem.	Period of tenure.	Remarks.
Public Works and Labour Department—			
Executive Engineer.	625—1,375	From 15th January 1932 to 31st March 1934.	For the Kattalai Special Division. Originally sanctioned for two years from 8th April 1931. The division was abolished in September 1931 and revived from 15th January 1932 in G.O. No. 144 I., dated 18th January 1932.

S. A. VENKATARAMAN,
Deputy Secretary to Government,
Finance Department.

APPENDIX XVII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

G.O. No. 266, Finance, dated 4th May 1932.

The Public Accounts Committee and the Standing Finance Committee of the Legislative Council for the year 1932–33 will be constituted as follows:—

A. PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Nominated by His Excellency the Governor.

1. The Hon'ble the Finance Member (*Chairman*).
2. A. W. Hutton, Esq., M.L.C.
3. M.R.Ry. T. Sundara Rao Nayudu Garu, M.L.C.

Elected by the Non-official members of the Council.

4. M.R.Ry. D. V. Narasimhaswami Garu, M.L.C.
5. Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur, M.L.C.
6. M.R.Ry. P. V. Rajagopala Pillai Avargal, M.L.C.
7. B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur, M.L.C.
8. M.R.Ry. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti Garu, M.L.C.
9. M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar Avargal, M.L.C.
10. M.R.Ry. M. Devadasan Avargal, M.L.C.

B. STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE.

Nominated by His Excellency the Governor.

1. The Hon'ble the Finance Member (*Chairman*).
2. M.R.Ry. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar Avargal, M.L.C.
3. M.R.Ry. C. Basu Dev Avargal, M.L.C.

Elected by the Non-official members of the Council.

4. M.R.Ry. A. B. Shetty Avargal, M.L.C.
5. F. E. James, Esq., M.L.C.
6. Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri (Raja Velugoti Sarvagnya Kumarakrishna Yachendrula Varu), M.L.C.
7. Zamindar of Mirzapuram (Mirzapuram Raja alias Venkataramayya Appa Rao Garu), M.L.C.
8. M.R.Ry. Rao Sahib V. I. Munuswami Pillai Avargal, M.L.C.
9. Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur, M.L.C.
10. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar Avargal, M.L.C.
11. M.R.Ry. R. M. Palat Avargal, M.L.C.

(By order of the Governor in Council)

S. A. VENKATARAMAN,
Deputy Secretary to Government.

To all Departments of the Secretariat.
,, the Accountant-General, Madras.
,, all Secretaries to Government.
,, all members of the Public Accounts and Finance Committees.
,, the Secretary to the Legislative Council (for communication to the members of the Legislative Council).

APPENDIX XVIII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

G.O. No. 1944, L. & M., dated 27th May 1932.

READ—the following papers:—

G.O. No. 1114, L. & M., dated 23rd March 1932.
G.O. No. 1884, L. & M., dated 23rd May 1932.

Order—No. 1944, *L. & M., dated 27th May* 1932.

The Government, on receipt of further information from the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards, find that the elections to all the panchayats that were union boards on the 25th August 1930, other than those mentioned in the appendix to G.O. No. 1884, L. & M., dated the 23rd May 1932, cannot be completed before the 31st May 1932 as stated in the order. A short extension of time has thus become inevitable.

2. In exercise of the power conferred by rule 6 (1) (*b*) of the schedule to the Madras Local Boards (Amendment) Act, 1930, the Government are therefore pleased to postpone the date fixed in G.O. No. 1114, L. & M., dated the 23rd March 1932, for the retirement of members of all panchayats that were unions on the 25th August 1930, other than those mentioned in the appendix to G.O. No. 1884, L. & M., dated the 23rd May 1932, and for the coming into office of the newly elected members and to fix the following dates in lieu thereof:—

Tinnevelly district— Sivagiri. Eruvadi. Kayalpatnam. Udangudi. Tanjore district— Nannilam. Guntur district— Tadikonda. South Arcot district— Vadakkanandal.	30th June 1932.
All other panchayats.	10th June 1932.

3. This order will not apply to panchayats which have been superseded for specified periods.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

E. CONRAN SMITH,
Secretary to Government.

To all Presidents of District Boards, with copies for Presidents of Panchayat Boards (ex-unions).
,, all Presidents of Taluk Boards.
,, the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, all Deputy Inspectors of Municipal Councils.
,, all District Election Officers.
,, all Collectors.
,, the Secretary to the Legislative Council for placing the order on the table of the Legislative Council.

Copy to the Revenue Department.

2nd August 1932]

APPENDIX XIX.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

G.O. No. 2132, L. & M., dated 8th June 1932.

READ—the following paper:—

G.O. No. 1944, L. & M., dated 27th May 1932.

Order—No. 2132, *L. & M., dated 8th June* 1932.

In G.O. No. 1944, L. & M., dated the 27th May 1932, the Government fixed the 10th June 1932 for the retirement of the existing members of the Manamadurai Panchayat, besides others, and for the coming into office of the newly elected members. As the elections to the panchayat will not be completed before the 10th June, a short postponement of the date has become necessary. In exercise of the power conferred by rule 6 (1) (*b*) of the Schedule to the Madras Local Boards (Amendment) Act, 1930, the Government accordingly postpone the date fixed in G.O. No. 1944, L. & M., dated 27th May 1932, and fix the 30th June 1932, in lieu thereof.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

E. CONRAN SMITH,
Secretary to Government.

To the President, Panchayat Board, Manamadurai.
,, President, Taluk Board, Sivaganga.
,, President, District Board, Ramnad.
,, Collector of Ramnad.
,, Inspector of *Municipal Councils and Local Boards.*
,, Deputy Inspector of Municipal Councils, Trichinopoly.
,, District Election Officer, Ramnad.
,, Secretary, Legislative Council, for placing the order on the table of the Legislative Council.

APPENDIX XX.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 8832-3, dated the 30th May 1932.

With reference to the answer given to question No. 1102 in the Legislative Council on the 23rd March 1932, the following information is laid on the Table of the House:—

* 1102 *Q.*—MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether Messrs. Meka Adinarayana Nimmoyadda Venkatakrishnayya and G. Suryaprakasa Rao who were distributing leaflets on different occasions were taken to Robertsonpeta Police station (Kistna district), beaten with lathis in the Police lock-up and let off; and

[2nd August 1932

(b) if so, why they were not proceeded against in a court of law for any offence that they may have committed, instead of being beaten with lathis?

A.—(a) None of them was taken to the Police station and beaten.
(b) Does not arise.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXI.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 8835-1, dated the 30th May 1932.

With reference to the answer to question No. 1075 given in the Legislative Council on the 21st March 1932, the following information is placed on the Table of the House:—

* 1075 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether Rami Reddi, Subba Reddi and two others of Kaja, which is about ten miles from Masulipatam, were arrested for taking part in a meeting, and afterwards instead of being proceeded against in a court of law, were beaten with lathis in the Robertsonpeta lock-up, and whether Subba Reddi received an injury on the head as the result of the beating?

A.—No persons of the names given were taken to the Robertsonpeta lock-up and no one was beaten in the lock-up.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10129-2, dated the 30th May 1932.

With reference to the answer to question No. 1100 given in the Legislative Council on the 23rd March 1932, the following information is placed on the Table of the House:—

* 1100 Q.—Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware that on the 25th February last at 10 a.m. Congress volunteers Messrs. Pitchai Kone and Devendra Kone when distributing Congress notices near Krishnagar, Teppakulam in Madura, were arrested and taken to No. 2 Police station;

2nd August 1932]

(*b*) whether it is a fact that they were kept in custody from 11 a.m. on the 25th to 6-30 p.m. on the 26th February without being provided with food even once during the whole period and that they were not even allowed to get their food themselves; and

(*c*) whether it is a fact that they were threatened and beaten and compelled to state who published the notices and where they were published?

A.—(*a*) The persons in question were found distributing unauthorized news-sheets containing Congress literature. They were arrested and taken to the Police station with a view to prevent the continuance of the offence. They were not put into the lock-up.

(*b*) They were in the station premises from about 10-30 a.m. to 7-20 p.m. on the 25th. They were not in the lock-up and so were at liberty to procure their own food but apparently preferred not to do so.

(*c*) They were questioned as to the source of the unauthorized news-sheets but were not threatened or beaten.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXIII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10592-2, dated the 30th May 1932.

With reference to the answer given to question No. 1120 in the Council on the 24th March 1932, the following information is placed on the Table of the House:—

* 1120 *Q.*—MR. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether a picketer Ayyasami who was not a member of an unlawful assembly was severely beaten by the Police in the City of Madura early in January and after he was disabled and prostrated the Police Sub-Inspector beat him further when he was lying on the ground unable to move and also kicked him with his boot-heel on his chest and ribs;

(b) whether this instance was taken to the notice of the Distric Magistrate and the District Superintendent of Police soon after i occurred and whether they were satisfied that it was a case of unwarrantec use of force and of excessive force; and

(c) whether any disciplinary action has been taken against o punishment awarded to the Sub-Inspector concerned; if not, why not?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The Government understand that the hon. Membe made the allegation informally to the District Magistrate and the District Superintendent of Police. The pickete Ayyaswami may have been beaten in the course of the dispersal of one of the unlawful assemblies of picketers which had to be dispersed forcibly in Madura early in January, but no complaint was made by him of the use of excessive force. In the absence of any attempt to substantiate the allegations, the District Magistrate took no further proceedings.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXIV.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 8835–2, dated the 31st May 1932.

With reference to the answer given to question No. 1074 in the Legislative Council on the 21st March 1932, the following further information is placed on the table of the House:—

Mikilineni Ramakotayya was concerned in the harbouring of volunteers from the Komaravolu Sibiram. He was sent for on 16th January 1932, whereupon a large crowd came towards the Police in a threatening attitude. They were therefore declared an unlawful assembly and were ordered to disperse. As they refused to do so, they were dispersed by force; Ramakotayya was in the crowd and received some lathi blows during the dispersal. He was not beaten for hoisting a national flag or for showing hospitality to congress people.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXV.

[*Vide* item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 *supra*.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 8839-2, dated 4th June 1932.

With reference to the answer to Question No. 1101 answered in the Legislative Council on the 23rd March 1932, the following information is laid on the table of the House.

* 1101 *Q*.—Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether Srimathis Cherukururi Veeyamma and two other lady volunteers picketed the toddy shop of Kommunur village, Gudivada taluk, Kistna district, on the 14th February 1932;

(*b*) whether the Police splashed them with coloured water on that day;

(*c*) whether on the 15th idem the Police poured toddy over their heads in addition to drenching them with coloured water;

(*d*) whether on the next day (16th February 1932) while repeating the above process, the Police indulged in insulting and obscene language;

(*e*) whether on the 17th idem the Police poured coloured water over their heads, removing sarees therefrom;

(*f*) whether on the 18th the Police poured tar mixed with marking-nut juice; and

(*g*) what action the Government have taken, or will take, against the offending Policemen?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) *to* (*f*) Coloured water was directed on the volunteers. It is not true that toddy or tar was used. The Police did not remove sarees from the heads of the women or insult them.

(*g*) The use of coloured water has been discontinued. No further action is required.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

[2nd August 1932

APPENDIX XXVI.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10136-2, dated the 4th June 1932.

With reference to the answer to Question No. 1176 given in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932, the following information is laid on the table of the House:—

1176 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that certain gentlemen were sent for by the Police Commissioner immediately prior to the arrival of the Indian Franchise Committee at Madras and when the said persons went to the Commissioner's office they were at once locked up, and have been kept under confinement ever since;

(*b*) if so, under what provision of the law this was done and how many such persons were locked up, and for what period; and

(*c*) whether the Government propose to enquire into the illegality or otherwise of this procedure?

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) & (*c*) Do not arise.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXVII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10092-3, dated 17th June 1932.

With reference to the answer given to Question No. 1121 in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932, the following information is placed on the table of the House:—

1121 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many persons were arrested in the City of Madras just prior to and after the arrival of the Indian Franchise Committee at Madras in connexion with the Civil Disobedience Movement;

(*b*) how many of them are still under remand and how many have been released;

(*c*) against how many of these are prosecutions launched or intended to be launched, and for what offence and under what code;

(*d*) how many of these were originally arrested under warrant and how many without a warrant; and

2nd August 1932]

(e) what the procedure adopted was in the case of those who were not arrested under warrant?

A.—(a) 70.

(b) Still under remand—Nil.

Released on	27th February 1932 ...	...	12
,,	29th February 1932 ...	...	6
,,	4th March 1932 ...	...	5
,,	5th March 1932 ...	...	5
,,	9th March 1932 ...	...	15
,,	11th March 1932 ...	...	7
Released on apology	... ...	...	11

(c) Nine persons were prosecuted under section 17 (1) of the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908.

(d) & (e) All were arrested without warrant under section 17 of the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908. Nine were prosecuted and convicted. The remainder were released, some on their expressing regret, others because they were persons of no status for whom a warning by the Commissioner was sufficient.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

APPENDIX XXVIII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 9462/2, dated the 20th June 1932.

With reference to the answer to the supplementary question to Question No. 1237 given in the Legislative Council on 24th March 1932, the signatories of the complaint are given below:—

(1) U. Mesha Rao, Pleader, Kasaragod.
(2) K. Sundar Rama Shetty, Vakil.
(3) K. Krishna Bhat, Vakil.
(4) Th. Devadar Shenoy, Vakil, Kasaragod.
(5) M. G. Ganesh Narayana Pai, Advocate.
(6) K. Ganesh Rao, Vakil, Kasaragod.
(7) C. M. Kamath, Vakil, Kasaragod.

(8) C. Rama Rao, Pleader, Kasaragod.
(9) }
(10) } Illegible.
(11) M. Panduranga Rao, Hosdrug.
(12) V. V. Kamath, Insurance Agent, Kunhangad.
(13) Illegible.
(14) K. Madhava Naik, Insurance Agent, Kunhangad.
(15) H. Janardhan Kamath, Kunhangad.
(16) *Illegible, merchants, Hosdrug.*
(17) K. Keshav Pai, Merchant, Kasaragod.
(18) U. Miltal Bhandari, Merchant, Hosdrug.
(19) A. Vittal Kamath, son of H. Raghunath Kamath.
(20) K. Vamana, Upendra, Shenoy, Merchant, Kunhangad.
(21) Illegible.
(22) K. Sreedhara Srinivasa Shenoy, Merchant, Kunhangad.
(23) K. Madhava Srinivas Kamath, Katcheri.
(24) H. Sitharama Maiya, Vakil, Kasaragod.
(25) Illegible, Vakil, Kasaragod.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

APPENDIX XXIX.

[*Vide* item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10783-2, dated the 20th June 1932.

With reference to the answer to the Legislative Council Question No. 1259 given on 24th March 1932, the following further information is placed on the Table of the House:—

1259 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether it is a fact that on the 16th January 1932, the Subdivisional Magistrate, Gudivada, sent for one Mikkilaneni Akkayya of Pedamaddali and assaulted him with lathi for celebrating the flag day on the 14th January 1932?

A.—The allegation that the Subdivisional Magistrate sent for one Mikkilaneni Akkayya of Pedamaddali on 16th January 1932 and assaulted him with a lathi for celebrating the flag day on the 14th January 1932 is untrue. The facts are as follows:—

On the 16th January the Subdivisional Magistrate went with Reserve Police to Pedamaddali. There was some

disturbance in connexion with the arrest of Mikkilaneni Ramakotayya, and the Police had to use their lathis. Possibly this man Akkayya was one of the crowd who was injured during the lathi charge. He is unknown to the Subdivisional Magistrate.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

APPENDIX XXX.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10818-2, dated the 20th June 1932.

With reference to the answer to Question No. 1258 given on 24th March 1932, the following further information is placed on the Table of the House:—

* 1258 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Subdivisional Magistrate, Gudivada, went to Pamarru on the 15th January 1932 with a posse of police and sent for one Tamala Nagireddi and Painamaneni Pattabhiramayya and assaulted them with sticks and canes?

A.—*The allegation that the Subdivisional Magistrate sent for one* Tamala Nagireddi and Painamaneni Pattabhiramayya at Pamarru and assaulted them with sticks and canes is not correct. The facts are as follows:—

On the 15th January the Subdivisional Magistrate accompanied the Reserve Police and the Circle Inspector to Pamarru. There one Tammareddi Nagireddi and others were arranging to carry out some demonstration in furtherance of civil disobedience and, as they refused to disperse when ordered to do so, they were dispersed by a lathi charge. Tammareddi Nagireddi received some lathi blows in course of the dispersal. Possibly Painamaneni Pattabhiramayya was also beaten—the Subdivisional Magistrate does not know him.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

[2nd August 1932

APPENDIX XXXI.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

G.O. No. 2482, L. & M., dated 27th June 1932.

In G.Os. No. 1884, L. & M., dated the 23rd May 1932 and No. 1944, L. & M., dated the 27th May 1932, Government fixed the date for the retirement of members of panchayats which were unions on the 25th August 1930 and for the coming into office of the newly elected members as the 10th June 1932 in some cases and the 30th June 1932 in others. As the necessary preliminaries for the conduct of elections to some panchayats could not be completed in time, a short postponement has become unavoidable in their case.

2. In exercise of the power conferred by rule 6 (1) (*b*) of the Schedule to the Madras Local Boards (Amendment) Act, 1930, the Government are pleased to postpone the date fixed in G.Os. No. 1884, L. & M., dated the 23rd May 1932 and No. 1944, L. & M., dated the 27th May 1932, for the retirement of the members of the panchayats mentioned in the appendix to this order and for the coming into office of the newly elected members and to fix the 31st July 1932 in lieu thereof.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

E. CONRAN SMITH,
Secretary to Government.

To the Presidents of District Boards concerned with copies for Presidents of Panchayat Boards.
,, Presidents of Taluk Boards concerned.
,, Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, Deputy Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, District Election Officers concerned.
,, Collectors concerned.
,, Secretary, *Legislative Council, for placing the order on the table of the* Legislative Council.

Copy to Revenue Department.

Appendix.

TANJORE DISTRICT.

1. Valangiman.
2. Tirukattupalli.
3. Vedaranniyam.
4. Kodavasal.
5. Nannilam.
6. Pattukkottai.
7. Nidamangalam.
8. Melattur.
9. Tranquebar.

MADURA DISTRICT.

10. Kelamangalam.

RAMNAD DISTRICT.

11. Devipatnam.

TINNEVELLY DISTRICT.

12. Kadayanallur.

NORTH ARCOT DISTRICT.

13. Kaveripakkam.
14. Pudupalaiyam.

SOUTH ARCOT DISTRICT.

15. Vadakanandal.

SALEM DISTRICT.

16. Jalakantapuram.

ANANTAPUR DISTRICT.

17. Dharmavaram.

EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.

18. Samalkot.
19. G. Mamidada.

WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT.

20. Penukonda.

GUNTUR DISTRICT.

21. Phringipuram.
22. Tadikonda.

2nd August 1932]

APPENDIX XXXII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

G.O. No. 2500, L. & M., dated 27th June 1932.

In G.O. No. 1114, L. & M., dated the 23rd March 1932, the Government fixed the 30th June 1932 for the retirement of members of district and taluk boards and for the coming into office of the newly elected members. It is now found that while elections have been held in two districts, the necessary preliminaries for the conduct of elections in others are in different stages of progress necessitating the postponement of their reconstitution to different dates. Moreover, it has not been found possible to conduct the elections to panchayats originally constituted under the Madras Village Panchayats Act, 1920, within the date fixed, viz., 30th June 1932. A short postponement of the date of reconstitution has therefore become unavoidable in their case also.

2. In exercise of the powers conferred by rule 6 (1) (*b*) of the Schedule to the Madras Local Boards (Amendment) Act, 1930, the Government are hereby pleased to postpone, in respect of the district and taluk boards and panchayats shown in the appendix to this Order, the date fixed in G.O. No. 1114, L. & M., dated the 23rd March 1932, for the retirement of the existing members and for the coming into office of the newly elected members and to fix the dates shown against them in lieu thereof.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

E. CONRAN SMITH,
Secretary to Government.

To all Presidents of District Boards.
,, all Presidents of Taluk Boards.
,, all Collectors.
,, the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, all Deputy Inspectors of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, all District Election Officers.
,, the Secretary, Legislative Council, for placing the order on the table of the Legislative Council.
,, the Registrar, Madras University.
,, the Registrar, Andhra University.
,, the Revenue Department.

Appendix.

The Nilgiris District Board	14th July 1932.
All the taluk boards in the Chingleput district	15th July 1932.
The Chingleput District Board	22nd July 1932.
The district and taluk boards in the Madura district	31st July 1932.
All other district and taluk boards, ...	31st August 1932.
All panchayats which were originally constituted under the Madras Village Panchayats Act, 1920	31st August 1932.

[2nd August 1932

APPENDIX XXXIII.

[*Vide* item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 102 *supra*.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

With reference to clause (*f*) of question No. 1223 answered in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932 and the answer to the supplementary question thereto the following information is placed on the table of the House:—

Enquiries show that besides Mrs. Prabhu and the constables who escorted her to Vellore there were two ladies and three or four men in the compartment when the train left Tellicherry. They alighted at Calicut. Five or six other persons travelled in that compartment from Calicut as far as Shoranur. No other definite information could be obtained as to the number of passengers who travelled from Shoranur to Vellore, but as the compartment was a large one it is probable that there were several.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

27th June 1932.

APPENDIX XXXIV.

[*Vide* item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 102 *supra*.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10276-1, dated the 18th May 1932.

With reference to the answer to clause (*b*) of question No. **1119** given in the Council on the 24th March 1932, the following information is laid on the table:—

* **1119** *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether he has received a written complaint, dated 25th February 1932, from one V. Padmanabha Rao, Inamdar, Ponur (Guntur district), regarding the assault by the Police causing severe injuries on the following among other persons, for disobeying orders under section 144, Indian Penal Code:—

(*a*) Mr. Seshagiri Rao on 18th February 1932 who received over 50 cuts with a hunting whip;

(*b*) Messrs. Thumulur Sivaramayya and Koteswaralu on 10th February 1932:

(c) Messrs. Dasari Katiah Choudary and Suryadevara Krishniah Choudary volunteers from Nidubrole;

(d) Mr. Padmanabha Rao, who was beaten when going to his home; and

(b) if so, what action he has taken on the conduct of the Sub-Inspector and the head constable for causing such severe injuries to the persons named above as testified to by the copies of medical certificates furnished to the hon. the Home Member?

A.—The persons referred to collected large crowds in public thoroughfares on the dates mentioned and incited them to defy the laws. The crowds obstructed the traffic and behaved in a disorderly manner. They refused to disperse when ordered to do so on each occasion. After due warning they were dispersed by force. Only the minimum force required was used and the persons referred to sustained only slight injuries.

T. Sivaramayya and T. Koteswara Rao were tried and convicted under section 17 (1) of the Criminal Law Amendment Act and section 117, Indian Penal Code, by the Joint Magistrate, Ongole. They did not complain of the use of excessive force either before or at their trial. A. Seshagiri Rao preferred a complaint of hurt against the Station-house Officer in the Sub-Magistrate's Court, Ponur, in which he alleged that some of the injuries were caused by the beating he received at the hands of the Police as he was going from his house. The complaint was returned for presentation before the Joint Magistrate but A. Seshagiri Rao failed to proceed with it.

The allegation that Padmanabha Rao was beaten when going home is false. He joined his brother Seshagiri Rao in collecting the crowd on 18th February 1932 and was beaten during the dispersal of the crowd.

As A. Seshagiri Rao failed to proceed with his complaint, the Government assume that he was unable to substantiate the allegations made and do not propose to take any further action.

G. T. H. Bracken,
Chief Secretary.

Appendix XXXV.

[*Vide* item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 102 *supra*.]

Finance Department.

COMMUNICATION TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, No. 22334-ER/1, DATED 11th JULY 1932.

With reference to the answer given by the hon. the Finance Member to the question No. 394 and to the supplementary question thereto on 31st October 1931, the following statement is placed on the table:—

The Government understand as a result of enquiries made from other Provinces that their Retrenchment Committees have made no such general recommendations as those mentioned by the hon. Member either on the subject of allowances (question No. 394) or on the subject of intermediary posts (question No. 395).

In fact, the Madras Retrenchment Committee appear to have gone further in these matters than those of other Provinces.

H. M. Hood,
Secretary to Government.

Appendix XXXVI.

[*Vide* item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 102 *supra*.]

Public (General) Department.

U.O. Note No. 10130-2, dated the 9th June 1932.

With reference to the supplementary questions and answers given in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932 with reference to question No. 1220, the following information is laid on the table of the House:—

Messrs. Khasa Subba Rao and O. P. Ramaswami were not present during the enquiry held by the Commissioner of Police as they were then in-patients in the Government General Hospital.

Bus owners and drivers were asked to give evidence.

G. T. H. Bracken,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXXVII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 102 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 8837-3, dated the 9th June 1932.

With reference to the answer to question No. 1113 given in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932 the following information is laid on the table of the House:—

Pinnamaneni Veerayya and Gullapalli Sreeramulu received lathi blows during the dispersal of the unlawful assembly on the 15th January 1932 under the circumstances stated in the answer to the question.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXXVIII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 102 supra.]

Statement of Action taken by the Government on Resolutions passed during the Second Session of the Fourth Madras Legislative Council, 1931–32.

Serial number and subject of resolution.	When *passed* by the Council.	*Nature of action taken by the* Government.
(1) This Council recommends to the Government to make an immediate enquiry and if necessary to appoint a committee of both officials and non-officials to investigate into, and to report on, the ill-treatment of the depressed classes in the Devakottai subdivision of the Ramnad district as alleged in the Memorandum submitted to Government by the President of the Ramnad District Adi-Dravida Mahajana Sabha.	4th Aug. 1931.	The Government did not consider it necessary to appoint a committee. As promised by the hon. the Home Member in the Council, copies of the speeches made in the Council on the subject were forwarded to the District Magistrate, Ramnad, and he was asked to bring together the leading members of both communities, the Kallars and the Adi-Dravidas, and to endeavour to arrive at a restoration of amicable relations between the two classes. The District Magistrate reported in November 1931, that the trouble had subsided and that the advice of Government had been noted for future guidance should there be similar disturbances in the neighbourhood.

Serial number and subject of resolution.	When passed by the Council.	Nature of action taken by the Government.
(2) Construction of an anicut across the river Ponniar (South Pennar) to divert the excess of flood and other water of the river for irrigation in Tiruvannamalai and Chengam taluks, North Arcot district.	4th Aug. 1931.	Two schemes which were considered and dropped were referred to by the hon. the Revenue Member in his speech on the resolution. As regards the other schemes mentioned, several sites for the construction of an anicut across the Ponniar were examined in 1893 and a proposal came up in 1903 for the construction of an anicut with a main channel to take off from the right bank at Kurumapattu village. The proposal was dropped as it was found that it would affect adversely the Tirukkoyilur Anicut system and irrigation lower down. Two suggestions made by M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur Arogyaswami Mudaliyar were: (1) Construction of a reservoir on the Upper Gadilam at Puttanandal with a supply channel from the Tirukkoyilur anicut and (2) Construction of a storage reservoir with a capacity of 15,000 million cubic feet at Agaram Pallipattu for extension of irrigation under the system. It was decided that the supply of water was inadequate for a successful scheme under either of these proposals. In all these cases, the chief reason for abandoning the projects suggested has been that there is not sufficient supply of water available in a very large proportion of years for a new scheme without detriment to the existing irrigation under the Tirukkoyilur anicut and below, and after supplying the needs of the area irrigated by the Nedungal anicut above. In these circumstances the Government are unable to give effect to the resolution.
(3) Condition of the Madrasis in Burma and the urgent need for taking necessary steps to safeguard their personal property, etc.	5th August 1931.	The proceedings of the Council were forwarded to the Government of India and the Government of Burma.
(4) Raising of certain Madras infantry battalions.	Do.	A copy of the proceedings of the Legislative Council on the resolution was forwarded to the Government of India, Army Department, on 29th September 1931.
(5) This Council recommends to the Government that the consideration of the proposal of the Special Settlement Officer as approved by the Board of Revenue for enhancement of assessment in Malabar be postponed until normal conditions	2nd Nov. 1931.	The Government on an examination of all the circumstances came to the conclusion that there was no justification for postponing the introduction of resettlement in the district. Orders were accordingly issued in G.O. No. 2717, Revenue, dated the 23rd December 1931, and the order was made available to the Press.

Serial number and subject of resolution.	When passed by the Council.	Nature of action taken by the Government.
(6) Committee to enquire into the incidence of taxation on Motor Vehicles in the Madras Presidency.	2nd Nov. 1931.	In accordance with the resolution of the Legislative Council the Government appointed in G.O. No. 34, L. & M., dated 6th January 1932, a committee consisting of seven members. The Government Order was placed on the table of the House. The interim report of the committee was also placed on the table of the House on the 24th March 1932. Of the four recommendations made by the committee one has been approved by the Government and given effect to. The other recommendations are under consideration.
(7) This Council recommends to the Government that the collection of land revenue be extended over six instalments of equal amounts.	Do.	The question is under consideration.
(8) Introduction of graded cut in salaries of Government servants.	28th Jan. 1932.	No action was taken on the resolution for the reasons given by the hon. the Finance Member during the discussion.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Council.

21st July 1932.

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

Wednesday, the 3rd August 1932.

The House met at eleven of the clock, Mr. President (the hon. Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI) in the Chair.

PRESENT:

Usman Sahib Bahadur, *Kt.*, The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed.
Krishnan Nayar, *Kt.*, The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M.
Archibald Campbell, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., C.B.E., V.D., I.C.S., The hon. Sir.
Stokes, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. H. G.
Muniswami Nayudu, The hon. Diwan Bahadur B.
Rajan, The hon. Mr. P. T.
Kumaraswami Reddiyar, The hon. Diwan Bahadur S.
Abdul Hameed Khan, Mr.
Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur.
Alamelumangathayaramma, Mrs. K.
Arasu, Mr. V. T.
Ari Gowder, Mr. H. B.
Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur R. N.
Basheer Ahmed Sayeed, Mr.
Basu Dev, Mr. C.
Bayappa Reddi, Mr. P.
Beyabani Sahib Bahadur, S. M. K.
Bhanoji Rao, Mr. A. V.
Birley, Mr. F.
Davis, M.B.E., Mr. J. A.
Devadasan, Mr. M.
Dharmalingam Pillai, Rao Sahib V.
Ellappa Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur S.
Gopalaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur M.
Hood, I.C.S., Mr. H. M.
Hutton, Mr. A. W.
Indriah, Mr. C.
Jagannatham, Mr. H. M.
James, Mr. F. E.
Jayaram Nayudu, Rao Sahib C.
Jones, I.C.S., Mr. C. E.
Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu, Mr. K.
Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur P.
Kolanda Reddi, Rai Sahib C.
Koti Reddi, Mr. K.
Krishnamurti, Rao Sahib D.
Krishnan, Mr. C.
Krishnaswami Ayyar, *Kt.*, Diwan Bahadur Sir Alladi.
Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri, The.
Kuppuswami Choudari, Mr. J.
Lakshmana Reddi, Mr. G.
Luker, Mr. F. G.
Madanagopal Nayudu, Mr. R.
Madhusoodhanan Thangal, Mr. P.
Maharaja of Venkatagiri, The.
Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.
Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
Manikkavelu Nayakar, Mr. M. A.
Moidoo Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur T. M.
Moses, Mr. P. C.
Muniswami Pillai, Rao Sahib V. I.
Muthiah Chettiyar, Mr. M. A.
Muthu Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur P. C.
Nachiyappa Gounder, Mr. K. A.
Nadimuthu Pillai, Mr. A. Pl. N. V.
Nanjappa Bahadur, Subadar-Major S. A.
Narasa Reddi, Mr. T.
Narasimhaswami, Mr. D. V.
Narayanan Nambiyar, Mr. V. P.
Narayanaswami Pillai, Rao Bahadur T. M.
Natesa Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur C.
Newcomb, Lieut.-Col. Clive.
Palat, Mr. R. M.
Pannirselvam, Rao Bahadur A. T.
Parthasarathi Ayyangar, Mr. C. R.
Patnaik Mahasayo, Sriman M. G.
Patro, *Kt.*, Rao Bahadur Sir A. P.
Pattagar of Palayakottai, The.
Peddiraju, Mr. P.
Pocker Sahib Bahadur, B.
Premayya, Mr. G. R.
Rajagopala Pillai, Mr. P. V.
Raja of Bobbili, The.
Raja of Kallikote, The.
Ramalingam Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur T.A.
Ramamurti, Pandit Ganala.
Raman Menon, Mr. K. P.
Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. T. S.
Ramaswami Mudaliyar, Mr. V. M.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. A.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. G.
Rangaswami Reddi, Mr. M. B.
Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur C. S.
Sahajanandam, Swami A. S.
Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, Mr.
Satyanarayana Choudari, Mr. C.
Sesha Reddi, Mr. B. P.
Shetty, Mr. A. B.
Simhachalam Pantulu, Mr. Gade.
Singam Ayyangar, Mr. K.
Siva Raj, Rao Sahib N.

PRESENT—cont.

Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar, Mr. K. S.
Slater, C.M.G., C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. S. H.
Smith, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. E. C.
Sreshta, Mr. M. S.
Srinivasa Ayyangar, Mr. T. C.
Srinivasan, Rao Bahadur R.
Sriramulu, Mr. G.
Stanes, Mr. F. J.
Subbarayan, Dr. P.
Subrahmanya Chetti, Rao Sahib P.
Subrahmanya Bhatt, Mr. U. C.
Sundara Rao Nayudu, Mr. T.
Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur, Khan Sahib.
Thomas, Mr. Daniel.
Thorne, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. J. A.
Venkatachala Reddiyar, Mr. K. C. M. (Zamindar of Minampalli).
Venugopal Nayudu, Rao Bahadur R. K.
Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
Zamindar of Chemudu (Sri Vyricherla Narayana Gajapati Raju), The.
Zamindar of Kirlampudi (Sri Raja Ravu Ramakrishna Ranga Rao), The.
Zamindar of Mirzapuram (Mirzapuram Raja alias Venkataramayya Appa Rao), The.

I.—*QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.*

STARRED QUESTIONS

Education

Extent of retrenchment in the Educational department.

* 56 *Q.*—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the amount retrenched is in the departments of elementary, secondary and collegiate education, in grants, maintenance of institutions, building and equipment grants, etc., and staff in the offices;

(*b*) whether a place of Deputy Director of Public Instruction was recommended to be abolished; and

(*c*) whether it was abolished; if not, why not?

A.—(*a*) The hon. Member is referred to Table B in Appendix III to the Report of the Madras Retrenchment Committee which shows the savings effected under the several heads in 1931–32. Orders on some of the recommendations of the Committee are just being given effect to. Certain recommendations, particularly those relating to grants to non-Government institutions, are still under consideration. It is not, therefore, possible to calculate *at present* the amount of retrenchment in the current year.

(*b*) & (*c*) The hon. Member is referred to paragraph 15 on page 122 of the Report referred to above. The Committee did not recommend the abolition of a post of Deputy Director, but recommended a *reduction* in the number of deputies by one and suggested that the post of Deputy Directress might be held in abeyance rather than the temporary post of Deputy Director for Elementary Education. The Government accepted the suggestion.

Report of the Muslim Education Committee.

* 57 *Q.*—Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether he has received the report of the Muslim Education Committee;

3rd August 1932]

(b) if so, on what date it was received; and

(c) whether the Government have passed any orders on the report?

A.—(a) & (b) Yes, on the 22nd March 1932.

(c) The report is under consideration.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I ask when the Government expect to pass orders on the report? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" I cannot say."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know whether copies of the report will be made available to the Members of the House? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" When the time comes; not at once."

Excise

Memorial from the menials of the Excise department asking for a change in their appellation.

* 58 Q.—Mr. V. T. ARASU: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether Government have received any memorial or representation from the association of the menials in the Excise department asking for a change in their appellation; and

(b) if so, what orders were passed by the Government thereon?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The Government declined to grant the request.

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" May I know what is the change that was asked for here? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" So far as I remember they asked for a change in their designation. They wanted to be called constables."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" What is the objection on the part of the Government for effecting the change? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" They can do equally well with their present designation. There is no reason for the change."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" Will this change cause any financial loss to Government? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" It may not; but that is not the only consideration."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" What are the other considerations, Sir? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" I am not prepared to give a list of them. I want notice if my hon. Friend is anxious about knowing all the considerations on which the order was based."

[3rd August 1932

Co-operation

Representation of Muslims in the higher grades of the Co-operative Department.

* 59 *Q.*—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of Assistant, Deputy and Sub-Deputy Registrars in the Co-operative Department and the community to which each one of them belongs as on the 30th of June 1932;

(*b*) the number of Muslim Assistant, Deputy and Sub-Deputy Registrars and the nature of appointment each one of them holds as on the 30th of June 1932; and

(c) what steps the Government have taken or propose to take to raise the proportion of Muslims in the Co-operative Department?

A.—(*a*) There are no Assistant Registrars in the Department. The information about the Deputy and Sub-Deputy Registrars is given below :—

	Number of officers.	Communities to which they belong.	
Deputy Registrars.	23	Brahman	7
		Non-Brahman (Hindu) ..	11
		Christian	2
		Muhammadan	2
		Other communities ..	1
		Total ..	23
Sub-Deputy Registrars.	37	Brahman	23
		Non-Brahman (Hindu) ..	11
		Muhammadan	1
		Other communities ..	1
		Anglo-Indian or European	1
		Total ..	37

(*b*) Deputy Registrars—Two ; both are acting.
Sub-Deputy Registrars—One ; permanent.

(*c*) Recruitment to the cadre of Deputy Registrars and direct recruitment to the cadre of Sub-Deputy Registrars are governed by the communal rule.

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I ask what steps the Government have taken to increase the representation of Muslims in the superior cadre of the Co-operative Service?."

3rd August 1932]

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"No particular step has been taken, excepting that the communal Government Order will apply and the Muhammadans will have adequate representation."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know since when the communal Government Order is being applied, and whether it is the case that even after the application of the communal Government Order there are only two deputy registrars and one sub-deputy registrar in the whole service from among the Muslim community?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"I believe Muhammadan candidates were not available in spite of the advantage given by the communal Government Order."

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—"In the answer it is given 'Other communities ...1'. May I know what is meant by 'other communities'?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"I believe the depressed class communities. I cannot say anything more definite off-hand."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"Is it not a fact that two applications for these posts from among the Muhammadans are pending with Government?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"Not only two, but three; but all of them are over-aged."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know whether the Minister wants us to understand that in spite of advertisement having been made Mussalmans were not forthcoming?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"Mussalmans did apply and they were selected; but by the time vacancies arose they were over-aged."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask whether the Government have not the power to exempt these people from age-limit?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"I do not think the Government can exempt in any particular case."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"In view of the dearth of candidates among Mussalmans, will they not be pleased to exempt them from age-limit?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"Government cannot exercise this power in individual cases."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know whether Government will keep in view these things and show some special consideration to Mussalmans in order to equalize their representation in the service?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"When the vacancies arise."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"At the time when the vacancies arise, will Government be pleased to give preference to them?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN :—" I do not think they can have any preference when they have their turn according to the communal Government Order."

Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" Arising out of the answer to the question of my hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed, may I know whether it is their opinion that Government have no power to exempt candidates from age-limit? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN :—" Not in individual cases."

Khan Bahadur P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" In view of the fact that Muhammadans are badly represented in this particular department, will Government be pleased to give exemption to this community? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN :—" An amendment should be made to the rules. In certain cases I think the age-limit has been raised from 25 to 27. Muhammadans and depressed classes, I think, come under that."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" May I know whether the age-limit will be raised in the case of the Co-operative department in respect of Mussalmans in reference to the posts of deputy registrar and sub-deputy registrar? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN :—" I shall consider the suggestion."

Veterinary

Number and employment of students who passed the diploma examinations in the Veterinary College.

* 60 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many students have passed in the diploma examinations held in the Veterinary College in 1930, 1931 and in 1932; and

(*b*) how many of these have so far been given employment in the Madras Veterinary Department ?

A.—(*a*) 85.

(*b*) 29 were given employment. Three of those appointed in 1931 had to be discharged as a measure of retrenchment.

Local Self-Government

Licence fee schedules for buses since January 1932.

* 61 *Q.*—Mr. F. E. JAMES : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many District Board licence fee schedules for buses have been sanctioned since January the 1st, 1932;

(*b*) how many of such schedules represent an increase and how many a decrease in licence fees on the previous schedule;

(*c*) what is the average District Board licence fee on a 18-seater

3rd August 1932]

(*d*) what is the average total amount levied on each 18-seater bus under District Board licence fees and provincial taxation throughout the Presidency (excluding Madras City)?

A.—(*a*) The licence fee schedules of the Anantapur, Coimbatore, West Godavari, Madura and the Nilgiri District Boards have been sanctioned since the 1st January 1932.

(*b*) There was no change in the rates of licence fees in respect of the Anantapur and Coimbatore District Boards (existing rates under the old by-laws were approved). The West Godavari District Board effected a reduction in the rate of fees on motor buses from half a pie per seat per day per mile to 5/12th pie per seat per day per mile. In the case of the Madura and the Nilgiri District Boards there was a slight increase as shown below. The revised rates in the two districts are considerably lower than the average for other districts in the Presidency.

Rates prior to 1st January 1932.	Rates after 1st January 1932.
Madura District Board—	
(i) Vehicles licensed to carry more than 16 passengers—Rs. 200 per half year.	(i) Vehicles licensed to carry more than 16 passengers—Rs. 200 per half year.
(ii) Vehicles licensed to carry over 10 but less than 17 passengers—Rs. 75 per half year.	(ii) Vehicles licensed to carry over 10 but less than 17 passengers—Rs. 100 per half year.
(iii) Vehicles licensed to carry over 5 but less than 11 passengers—Rs. 25 per half year.	(iii) Vehicles licensed to carry over 5 but less than 11 passengers—Rs. 50 per half year.
(iv) Vehicles licensed to carry 5 or less passengers—Rs. 15 per half year.	(iv) Vehicles licensed to carry 5 or less passengers—Rs. 25 per half year.
The Nilgiris District Board—	
(1) Vehicles intended to carry over 16 passengers—Rs. 30 per seat per year.	
(2) Vehicles of 10–16 seating capacity—Rs. 15 per seat per year (average).	Rs. 18 per seat per year.
(3) Vehicles of 7–10 seating capacity—Rs. 13 per seat per year (average).	

(*c*) About Rs. 960 a year.

(*d*) About Rs. 1,500 a year.

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"In view of the great disparity in licence fees between one district and another, will Government instruct the district boards to raise the rate of fees wherever they find it low?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"It is a matter entirely for the district boards to move."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"In view of the fact that the proceeds under the Motor Vehicle Taxation Act have

gone much below the anticipated revenue, will the Government be pleased to give the boards a lead in the matter? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" The complaint is that the licence fees now charged combined with the tax under the Motor Vehicles Taxation are very high and have driven a number of buses off the road. If in any particular district, the licence fees are very low, and if the district board moves in the matter, the Government will consider any proposal to raise the fees on its merits. But it is entirely a matter for the district board to move and satisfy the Government that the raising of the rates is necessary and justifiable."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—" May I know whether the Government will be pleased to amend the Act fixing a minimum and a maximum? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" That question is under consideration and there is also a Bill given notice of in which the matter will be considered."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know whether a sum of 3 to 4 lakhs is due to the Corporation of Madras in respect of this provincial tax? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" It is being paid in instalments."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" When is the last instalment going to be paid to the Corporation? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" As soon as *the amount is collected, and the division is made among the local* bodies."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know the number of instalments paid so far out of the tax to the local bodies? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" The instalments for 1931-32 have been paid."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" Is it not that only two instalments were paid and not others and on that account the local bodies and municipalities are suffering? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" What has been collected for 1931-32 has been paid."

Condition of motor transport in the Presidency.

* 62 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) the total amount of provincial tax due from motor vehicles for the year 1931–32 and the amount actually collected in 1931–32;

(*b*) the number of motor vehicles that were plying for hire at the beginning of 1931–32 and their number at the present time; and

(*c*) whether any enquiry has been made regarding the plight of motor transport business in the several districts of this province?

3rd August 1932]

A.—(*a*) It is not possible to specify the total amount of tax due in 1931–32 since a number of motor vehicles which appeared in the registers had in fact gone off the roads altogether. The amount of tax actually collected in the year was Rs. 29,69,073.

(*b*) The number at the beginning of 1931–32 was 4,172 and that in the first quarter of 1932–33 about 2,700.

(*c*) No enquiry has been made but the Government have received representations on the subject.

Number of motor vehicles licensed during 1931–32 *and the income therefrom.*

* 63 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR: "Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(i) the number of (*a*) buses, (*b*) lorries, (*c*) motor cars, and (*d*) motor cycles licensed during the year 1931–32 in each district;

(ii) the amount of provincial tax derived by the Government by the licensing of the said vehicles; and

(iii) the cost of collection of the taxes?

A.—(i) A statement [a] is appended.

(ii) Rupees 29,69,073.

(iii) Rupees 48,919.

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know the number of lorries, including buses, owned by the Police department?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I cannot answer that now, Sir."

Public Health

Disposal of the Cinema projectors, etc., of the Temperance Propaganda Committees, now defunct.

* 64 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the cinema projectors, magic lanterns and slides belonging to the late Temperance Propaganda Committees were given free to any of the local boards, and if so, to which of them; and

(*b*) whether the Government have declined to sanction the free supply of a cinema projector to the South Kanara District Board or the Puttur Taluk Board?

A.—(*a*) One cinema projector (inclusive of a generator and battery), one magic lantern and three sets of slides were given to each of the district boards of Coimbatore, Chittoor, Guntur, Salem and Tanjore.

(*b*) Yes.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know why the five districts have been specially favoured?"

[a] Printed as Appendix I on page 244 infra.

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" There is no question of special favour. When the Government decided to dispose of them they consulted the local boards as to who were willing to take them. The district boards should meet the cost of maintaining the buses and also of paying the taxation under the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act. Only five buses were available and the others were required for Police purposes."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—" May I know whether the Government have since passed orders that these vans should be transferred to the Police department ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" I do not know, Sir; I shall enquire."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—" The hon. Member can take it from me that the Government have issued an order asking them to transfer the vans to the Police department."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" I shall consider it."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" May I know whether the Chief Minister was not consulted when this Police Order was passed ?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" When we decided upon discontinuing the propaganda, the buses were at the disposal of the Government. We then proposed that all these might be handed over to the various district boards temporarily. Subsequently orders were passed directing that five district boards might have them and the others should be handed over to the Police."

Rao Bahadur T. M. NARAYANASWAMI PILLAI :—" The question refers only to the cinema projectors and not the other things. What is the objection to giving the magic lanterns and slides also free to these boards ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" No objection; only they must be paid for."

Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" May I know whether all the presidents of district boards were informed that these projectors were available and they received applications only from the five districts ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" The Director of Public Health was asked to publish a notice that these were available to the district boards, if they agreed to pay the tax on them, etc."

Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" In view of the fact that the district boards have been hard hit on account of the small income they derive, will Government be pleased to exempt them from motor taxation ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" No, Sir."

Religious and Charitable Endowments

Proposals for the amendment of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act.

* 65. *Q.*—MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state for how long the proposals of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board for the amendment of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act have been under the consideration of the Government and when they propose to undertake legislation on the subject?

A.—A comprehensive amendment Bill was drafted by the President, Hindu Religious Endowments Board, and sent to Government in November 1927. The amendments were examined and a draft Bill was prepared towards the end of 1930. Some of the provisions therein were embodied in the amending Acts passed as Act V of 1929, Act IV of 1930 and Act XI of 1931. The other provisions of the Bill contemplate—

(1) provincializing the Hindu Religious Endowments Board and the audit staff,

(2) splitting the Hindu Religious Endowments Board into an executive board and one or two judicial commissioners,

(3) placing excepted temples on a par with ordinary temples in regard to the control over their budgets.

It is not possible to provincialize the Hindu Religious Endowments Board owing to the present financial position of the Government. Power has, however, been taken under Act XI of 1931 to enable the Hindu Religious Endowments Board and District Committees to recover their contributions through the Collector as arrears of land revenue, which, it is hoped, will facilitate collections. The other two points are under consideration of the Government.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I know with reference to (*a*), when the Government expect to come to conclusion?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"The question is now placed before the Local Advisory Committee which is to meet again to-morrow."

List of temple committees, active and defunct.

* 66. *Q.*—MR. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) which of the temple committees are functioning now;

(*b*) which committees have been wound up; and

(*c*) whether the arrears of contributions due from temples are being collected through the revenue authorities, and if so, in which

[3rd August 1932

A.—(*a*) The temple committees in the Tanjore, South Arcot and Tinnevelly districts and the one constituted for the Madura Sri Minakshi Devasthanam and its allied institutions are functioning now.

(*b*) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to question No. 35. These committees have not been 'wound up' but have ceased to function on the expiry of their term.

(*c*) The information has been called for.

Wireless Installation

Proposals regarding broadcasting in this province.

* 67 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Madras branch of the European Association has submitted to the Government any scheme for broadcasting in this Province; and

(*b*) whether the Madras Government propose to take up broadcasting service?

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) The Government have not so far proposed to do so.

Mr. F. E. James:—" In view of the fact that there is a proposal under consideration by the Madras Corporation for the extension of the broadcasting service considerably beyond the limits of the municipal area, will the Government consider the desirability of resuming control ? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes:—" The Government will consider the hon. Member's suggestion."

Irrigation

Progress of the High Level Channel scheme.

*68 *Q.*—Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) in what stage the work of the High Level Channel scheme is at present and how far progress has been made;

(*b*) the extent of irrigation that has been provided in the High Level Channel scheme and whether the Government contemplate to make additional provision for a further extent of land to be irrigated and if so, to what extent and at what cost;

(*c*) whether the construction of the bed regulator is dependent on and as a preliminary to the construction of the High Level Channel;

(*d*) whether the Special division in charge of the bed regulator is carrying on the work of the High Level Channel scheme; if so, how

3rd August 1932]

(e) whether final orders have been passed regarding the extension of the period for the collection of kists in the Trichinopoly district and if so, the nature of such orders?

A.—(a) Land plans and schedules have been completed for about 16 miles and much progress has been made in investigation in connexion with the preparation of site surveys, working plans and estimates for the works to be sanctioned technically by the Superintending Engineer.

(b) (i) 20,552 acres.

(ii) Not as part of the present scheme.

(c) Both are parts of the same scheme and the Bed Regulator is necessary to enable the High Level Channel to get its supply.

(d) The Special Division is in charge not only of the Bed Regulator but also of the High Level Channel.

(e) The attention of the hon. Member is drawn to paragraphs 7 and 11 of G.O. No. 1162, Revenue, dated 6th June 1932, revising the kistbandi of all the taluks of the district with the exception of Karur as follows:—

January	6 annas.
February	6 ,,
March	4 ,,

Mr. K. SINGAM AYYANGAR:—" With reference to (a), may I know as to when these estimates will be ready and when the work will be put on hand ? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I cannot say how soon the estimates will be ready. The intention is to proceed with the work as soon as possible."

Land Revenue Administration

Religious and charitable service inams in the districts of South Arcot, Chingleput and the City of Madras.

* 69 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) what the original extent was of land, wet and dry, comprised in the religious and charitable service inams confirmed by the Commissioner in 1860 in the districts of South Arcot, Chingleput and the City of Madras and what the nature of the service in each case was;

(b) how much of this extent of inam lands has been since (i) enfranchised, (ii) resumed, (iii) re-assigned or re-granted, and when was the same done and for what reasons;

(c) what the extent is of religious and charitable service inam lands now remaining or existing in each of the taluks of South Arcot,

(*d*) in which of the religious and charitable service inams in the districts of South Arcot, Chingleput and the City of Madras are the terms of the grant being fulfilled and what the nature is of the service rendered in the respective inams ?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*d*) The Government are not in possession of these particulars. Their compilation would involve considerable labour and expense.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" Whether in view of the necessity to prevent the lands comprised in the religious and charitable endowments from being wasted or maladministered, the Government will be pleased to make a survey of the original extent of lands allotted for these purposes and then place their report before this Council in order to enable the non-official Members of this Council to bring into existence some sort of legislation to put a stop to any further maladministration or to prevent further disappearance of the existing wakf properties ? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" On the facts before us I am afraid that it will cost us a great deal of money to make such an investigation. If there has been any particular case where there has been maladministration, and the hon. Member draw my attention to it, I will make the necessary enquiries."

Khan Bahadur P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" May I know what would be the likely cost of this investigation ? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" That I cannot say. It may be deputing a special officer and so forth."

B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur :—" Does not the Government think it necessary to have some kind of wakf legislation on the right lines of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act and for that purpose it is necessary to have those particulars ? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" I am afraid it is not possible to undertake to make any such investigation."

B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur :—" Does the Government think it possible to have such a legislation without those particulars? That is my question."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" That is asking for opinion."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" May I ask whether it is really impossible to do that ? After all is it a great thing to depute one Deputy Collector to go round the whole Presidency and find out the exact state of the religious and charitable endowments concerning the Muslim community and place his report before a Committee of non-officials of this House ? Will not the Government give so much assistance to the non-official Members of this House with a view to enable them to frame a legislation of that kind for a very necessary purpose ? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" The Board's Standing Orders contain the rules of procedure that are to be adopted in these

cases, by those who are in the management of these institutions. In the absence of any proof that there has been a general failure to carry out those orders and that our present machinery is inadequate for the purpose, I am afraid I must decline to undertake any such investigation."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" May I ask whether, in view of the non-availability of such particulars, we cannot frame any kind of legislation, the hon. the Revenue Member will be reluctant to give us the exact position of those charitable endowments as they obtain at present."

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" I am afraid the cost of preparing such statistics will be very high. I do not know to what cases the hon. Member refers. I have said already that if the hon. Member brings before me any particular cases I shall have enquiries made."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" In view of the fact that the original extent of lands meant for religious and charitable purposes endowed by the then Government has dwindled and no one knows exactly how much is left and how much is not left, may I not ask the Revenue Department who are the best authorities on the subject to give us the details as to what exactly is the position of wakfs to-day."

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" If the hon. Member will bring to my notice specific cases, I shall have the necessary enquiries made."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" May I ask whether the Government receive reports from the Collectors with reference to the administration of these endowments? I understood the hon. Member to say that it is part of the regular duties of the Revenue Department."

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" I cannot say whether the required information can be collected from the jamabandi report. It is no doubt true that matters pertaining to the administration of these endowments are reported in the jamabandi."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" May I take it that the hon. Member will ask the Collectors to send annual reports according to the administration reports ? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" I will consider the suggestion."

B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur :—" May I ask whether there is any report from which it is possible for non-official Members to gather this information so that they may bring in a legislation ? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" I have already answered that question."

B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur :—" Is the Government aware that it is not possible for any private Member to bring any Bill of this sort without such information as has been already asked for and that such information will not be available to anybody except the Government ? "

Names of the present holders of the various religious and charitable service inams in the districts of South Arcot, Chingleput and the City of Madras.

* 70. *Q.*—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the names of the present holders of the various religious and charitable service inams in the districts of South Arcot, Chingleput and the City of Madras as entered in the revenue records of the districts and in what right they hold the inams;

(*b*) what steps have been taken by the Collectors and subordinate revenue authorities in South Arcot, Chingleput and Madras to see that the religious and charitable service inams confirmed by the Inam Commissioner are not enjoyed without the terms of the grant being fulfilled during the last five years; and

(*c*) what the effect was of the steps taken by the revenue authorities in the said districts ?

A.—(*a*) The compilation of these particulars will involve considerable labour and expense which will, in the opinion of Government, be hardly justified.

(*b*) & (*c*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to B.S.O. No. 54 which contains detailed instructions for the enforcement of the terms of the grant of religious and charitable inams. The Government presume that these instructions are being followed in the districts mentioned.

Public Service

Exemptions to persons who have put in 30 years of service.

* 71. *Q.*—Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether in pursuance of the retrenchment proposals or otherwise all persons who have put in 30 years of service have been retired;

(*b*) whether any exemptions were granted; and

(*c*) if so, what the grounds are upon which such exemptions were granted?

A.—(*a*) Government did not require all such officers to retire from service but have included them among the categories of officers to be selected for discharge, if necessary, where as a measure of retrenchment it is decided to reduce the total strength of any service. A copy of the statutory rules issued in the matter will be found published as Public (Services) Department Notification No. 52, dated the 31st March 1932, on pages 649–50 of Part I of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated the 5th April 1932.

(*b*) & (*c*) No exemptions have been granted.

3rd August 1932]

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—" May I know, with reference to answers to clauses (b) and (c), whether no exemptions have been granted and whether Government have passed orders on all applications requesting for exemption of certain men of over 30 years service from being made to retire or are their applications still pending disposal? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I am afraid I cannot say."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" May I know whether the answer relates to the Revenue department or to all departments? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" So far as I am aware, it applies to all departments."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—" In view of the hardship that will be caused to junior men in service, will the Government be pleased to turn down all requests for exemptions if they are pending in some cases? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I cannot make any promise of that kind."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" If Government are of opinion that men who have put in 30 years service are to be retired from service, they must also lay down that those who have put in 55 years of service should also be similarly retired."

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I think the answer given to clauses (b) and (c) refers to both. I think those men who have put in 55 years of service also come under this rule."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" In that case, the answer given here to clauses (b) and (c) is not correct. As a matter of fact, I know there are cases where exemptions have been given not once or twice, but even thrice."

Ports

Excess payment of leave allowance to Mr. G. G. Armstrong.

* 72 *Q.*—B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether Mr. G. G. Armstrong, Chairman of the Madras Port Trust, availed himself of leave during the year 1931; if so, for what period;

(b) what is the amount of leave allowance that he drew during the period;

(c) how much of that amount is in excess of the maximum leave allowance allowed under the Fundamental Rules; and

(d) why Government condoned this excess payment to an officer drawing Rs. 3,000 a month?

***A.*—As the hon. Member *is aware* the Local *Government* are *merely* the agents of the Government of India in regard to this matter.**

(a) Yes; 7 months and 12 days.

(b) Rs. 21,677-6-8.

[3rd August 1932

(c) The above amount of leave salary is in excess by Rs. 989–9–7 of the maximum leave allowance he could have drawn had the limits prescribed in Fundamental Rule 89 (2) been applied.

(d) The terms of his appointment did not specifically stipulate that the limits laid down in Fundamental Rule 89 (2) regarding the maximum amount of leave salary would apply to him. The Government did not therefore consider it necessary to insist on recovering from him any of the amount drawn as salary during the leave taken in 1931. They have, however, directed that the provisions of Fundamental Rule 89 (2) should be enforced whenever he goes on leave in future.

Expenditure on the Madras Port Staff Club.

* 73 *Q.*—B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Madras Port Staff Club is maintained from the funds of the Madras Port, and if so, what is the annual revenue and expenditure in respect of the Club;

(b) whether a sum of Rs. 4,000 was recently sanctioned for repairs to the roof of the Club; and

(c) whether persons not in the service of the Port are also members of the Club?

A.—(a) The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative. The second part does not arise.

(b) An estimate amounting to Rs. 4,000 was sanctioned by the Port Trust Board on the 8th May 1931 for renewing the roof of the Trust's premises which have been leased to the Madras Port Staff Club.

(c) Yes; such members are not however active members of the club, but are only honorary members.

Prisons

Compulsory retirement, etc., of officers in the Jail department.

* 74 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the recent rules and orders on retrenchment by means of compulsory retirement, etc., of officers was made applicable to the Jail department;

(b) if so, how many of the gazetted ranks and how many of the non-gazetted ranks were retired, and what the service of each of the persons so retired was; and

(c) if not, why not?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) & (c) The question of retiring an officer in the gazetted rank is under the consideration of Government. Particulars as to the officers who were retired in the non-gazetted ranks are not available and have been called for.

3rd August 1932]

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I ask who is this officer that is sought to be retired compulsorily?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"He is a gazetted officer. It is Mr. Krishna Ayyar, the Deputy Superintendent in the Coimbatore Central Jail."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know what is the total service that he has put in?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"All that is under investigation."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know whether there is any other person who has put in 25 or more than 30 years service and who is a gazetted officer and who will come under this rule?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"No other gazetted officer."

Desirability of abolishing the post of Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Prisons.

* 75 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) when the post of the Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Prisons was created and why;

(*b*) what the annual cost is of the establishment of the Personal Assistant and the staff under him, if any;

(*c*) when the post of the Manager to the office of the Inspector-General of Prisons was created and why;

(*d*) what the duties are of the Manager of the office of the Inspector-General of Prisons;

(*e*) what the annual cost is of the establishment of the Manager and his staff, if any;

(*f*) whether the Government have considered the question of retrenchment in the office of the Inspector-General of Prisons;

(*g*) if so, on what lines, and what the total effect is;

(*h*) whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to the possibility of abolishing the post of the Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Prisons without detriment to efficiency; and

(*i*) if not, whether the Government propose to examine this question with a view to retrenchment?

A.—(*a*) From 1st April 1930. To relieve the Inspector-General of Prisons of most of the routine office work which has increased in recent years and to enable him to devote his attention to matters of greater importance.

(*b*) & (*e*) The hon. Member is referred to the half-yearly list of non-gazetted officers of the Jail Department and the certified schools. No separate staff has been sanctioned for the Personal Assistant or the Manager.

(c) & (d) Over sixty years ago; for supervising the clerical and menial establishments of the Inspector-General's office.

(f) Yes.

(g) One temporary clerk on Rs. 35 a month was discontinued.

(h) & (i) The Government do not consider that the post of the Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Prisons can be abolished without detriment to efficiency. The Retrenchment Committee has recommended a reduction in the pay of the post and the recommendation is under the consideration of Government.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I ask when the post of Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Prisons was created? Is there any reason for the Government to think that from 1st April 1930 it would not be possible for the Inspector-General to carry on the work without the assistance of a Personal Assistant, although there was already a Manager of the office who was attending to all the duties?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Government think that both are necessary."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know what exactly is the nature of the work that has increased since 1930 to relieve which this Personal Assistant has been appointed?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"The work was increasing not since 1930, but before that."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know if up to 1930 the Manager could have managed the whole office of the Inspector-General of Prisons, what exactly was the amount of additional work that justified the creation of the post of Personal Assistant?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"It was because the Manager could not cope with the work that the Personal Assistant was appointed."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I know if the office of the Inspector-General of Prisons were to be removed from Ootacamund to Madras, the work can be better done and a Manager alone would be sufficient?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I do not know how this question arises out of the answer that I gave."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"What I said was that if the office of the Inspector-General of Prisons were removed to Madras, the Inspector-General himself would be better able to attend to his duties and thus there would be no necessity to have a Personal Assistant."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is not whether the Inspector-General would be better able to attend to his duties if his office were removed to Madras. That question does not arise out of this motion. It has not been stated that the Inspector-General of Prisons has not been doing his duties properly."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" It is claimed that the work is too heavy and he needs a *Personal Assistant* to attend to them. May I know what the reasons are for his stationing the office at Ootacamund and whether the removal of the office from Ootacamund to Madras will not give him more time to attend to his duties? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" It is impossible to answer that till the office is actually removed to Madras."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" May I know the nature of the additional work that has grown up in recent years?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Notice."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" May I know whether the Government have considered the possibility of further retrenchment by reason of the abolition of some jails in the department? I mean the Central Jail at Alipuram."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" It is not a Central Jail."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" Yes, I corrected myself and said ' some jails '."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" May I ask whether the Government have considered the possibility of amalgamating some of the certified schools in the district with the other school at Chingleput, and thereby effecting a retrenchment?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" It is not possible to amalgamate."

Prevalence of appendicitis among the Civil Disobedience prisoners.

* 76 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that a large number of civil disobedience prisoners suffered from appendicitis while in jails in the Presidency since the beginning of this year;

(*b*) if so, will the hon. Member state (i) their names, (ii) their class, (iii) the jails where they got the attack, (iv) the cause of their disease, (v) what treatment was given to each and where it was given and what the result was in each case; and

(*c*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter ?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have no information.

(*c*) The hon. Member is referred to rules 513–515 B and 573–581 of the Jail Manual regarding the treatment of sick prisoners in jails. The Government do not propose to take any action in the matter.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"May I know whether it is not a fact that the percentage of patients suffering from appendicitis in the several jails is increasing?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I am not aware of that."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask the hon. the Law Member whether Mr. Satyamurti, an ex Member of this House, is suffering from appendicitis?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"He is suspected to be suffering from appendicitis. I believe that the medical authorities have not yet come to a final conclusion."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether the Government would consider the desirability of releasing him or suspending his remaining term of the sentence?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"No such representation has been made to Government."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"May I know whether the hon. Member will be pleased to place the information referred to in clauses (*a*) and (*b*)?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Yes."

Treatment in the General Hospital of 'A' class prisoners suffering from illness.

* 77 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) when 'A' class prisoners suffer from illness and are sent to the General Hospital for treatment, in which ward they are placed; and

(*b*) what the cost per head is in the ward in which they are placed then and what the cost allowed for 'A' class prisoners in the jails is?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The information has been called for.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"May I know whether the information, when ready, will be placed on the table of the House?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Yes."

Supply of buttermilk to prisoners.

* 78 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Government have passed orders sanctioning the grant of buttermilk to prisoners; if so, when was the said order made and communicated to the Inspector-General of Prisons; and

(*b*) whether the said order has been put into operation and the prisoners in the jails been given buttermilk; if so, since which date are they being supplied with buttermilk?

3rd August 1932]

A.—(*a*) The hon. Member apparently refers to the supply of buttermilk to 'C' class prisoners and if so, the answer is in the negative. The scale of diet for 'A' and 'B' class prisoners includes buttermilk or curd.

(*b*) Does not arise.

Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I ask whether the hon. Member will be pleased to consider the advisability of supplying buttermilk to all classes of prisoners?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"I am afraid I cannot give an undertaking to that effect."

Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar:—"May I ask the hon. Member whether it is as a question of policy or medical advice these 'C' class political prisoners are not supplied buttermilk"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"The 'C' class prisoners are people not generally accustomed to buttermilk."

Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar:—"May I know whether this conclusion has been come to by the Government on any enquiry or is it merely *a priori* opinion of the hon. Member and if no enquiry is necessary?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"This conclusion is based upon Government's knowledge of the habits of the people."

Mr. K. Koti Reddi:—"May I know what authority the hon. Member has to say that 'C' class prisoners are not accustomed to buttermilk in their homes or what is the source of information from which he has come to this conclusion?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"On the general knowledge of Government."

Mr. K. Koti Reddi:—"May I know whether the hon. Member knows the habits of people in districts other than Malabar?"

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"If buttermilk could be supplied so that the total cost did not exceed the cost under the present scale, I suppose the Government will have no objection to supply them with buttermilk."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"I have gone into this question and I find that the cost of supplying buttermilk to all prisoners will be about 2 or 3 lakhs.

Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar:—"Will the Government be pleased to receive contribution from the public or relations for supplying buttermilk to these prisoners?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"No, Sir."

Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar:—"If the Government find that their statement about the need of supplying buttermilk is not correct

and that the 'C' class prisoners are accustomed to buttermilk, then will they be pleased to supply buttermilk to them?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"That depends upon the information which may be placed before me."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Will the Government be pleased to state if they tried to substitute any other thing for buttermilk without exceeding the cost?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"No, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know if the Superintendents of Jails have not recommended the supply of buttermilk without any extra cost being incurred?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"They have not."

Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Is it merely the question of cost
11-30 a.m. that has made the hon. the Law Member think that buttermilk is not required for 'C' class prisoners?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"It is not the question of cost alone."

B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur:—"May I know the reason why the Government is so much opposed to buttermilk?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Because all the prisoners do not require it."

* 79 *Q.*—[*Cancelled.*]

Law and Order—General

Return of the thali belonging to Mrs. Prabhu.

* 80 *Q.*—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the *thali* belonging to Mrs. Prabhu was returned to her; and

(*b*) if not, in whose possession it now is?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The *thali* is in the office of the District Magistrate of Malabar. It has been ordered to be returned on application to Mr. or Mrs. Prabhu who have been informed accordingly.

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask the hon. the Home Member whether the Government would return the *thali* to the party concerned without any application from her?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I am prepared to consider the suggestion."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"Was there any correspondence between the Government and Mr. and Mrs. Prabhu?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Between the jail authorities and Mr. and Mrs Prabhu."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" When this matter came up for discussion in this House some months ago, did not the hon. the Home Member promise to consider the question of returning the *thali* to Mrs. Prabhu without any application from her?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— " As a matter of fact we asked the Superintendent of the Jail to ascertain from Mrs. Prabhu whether she would take back the *thali*. She said ' no.' Therefore the *thali* is kept there and Mrs. Prabhu can take it whenever she wants it."

Alleged beating of Kunhambu Adiyodi and P. Raman by the Reserve Police, South Kanara, on 2nd March 1932.

* 81 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT : With reference to question No. 1072 answered on 21st March 1932 regarding the beating of Kunhambu Adiyodi and P. Raman on 2nd March 1932 in Kanhangod, will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have received the report in connexion with Dr. Pai's letter regarding the same; if so, what the report received regarding the same is and whether the hon. the Home Member will be pleased to place a copy of the same on the table of the House;

(*b*) whether the report is merely the statement of the Police or result of any enquiry that has been held; if so, who were the persons examined by the enquiring officer;

(*c*) whether the hon. the Home Member will be pleased to place on the table of the House a copy of Dr. Pai's letter to the hon. the Home Member together with the certificate of injuries given by the medical officer in charge of the Kanhangod Hospital showing that Kunhambu Adiyodi had received 56 injuries and P. Raman 21 injuries; and

(*d*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(*a*) Yes. The facts as reported by the District Magistrate are as follows. On the forenoon of the 2nd March 1932 a procession consisting of some volunteers and a crowd of about 30 persons went along the road headed by the two volunteers referred to in Dr. Pai's letter, shouting revolutionary slogans and distributing leaflets. They were stopped by the Police and after warning were ordered to disperse. On their refusal to obey, they were dispersed and the two volunteers in question received injuries. The two volunteers then walked to the railway station about three-fourths of a mile away to take train to their homes. Subsequently they returned in a car with Dr. Ganesh Pai between 12 and 1 p.m. and were admitted to the Local Fund Dispensary at 3 p.m. which is the hour at which the doctor comes to the hospital. One was discharged on the second day of admission and the other on the third day.

[3rd August 1932

As regards the allegations in Dr. Pai's letter, it is not true to say that the crowd began to collect only when the volunteers were stopped on the road by the reserve police. Lathis were not used to disperse the crowd but only canes. There is no reason to suppose that the volunteers were raised and beaten after they fell down on the ground or that they were dragged along the road or were left on the road unconscious about $1\frac{1}{2}$ furlongs away to the north of the hospital. The volunteers while being caned fell down feigning unconsciousness but within a couple of minutes got up and walked off. They did not want to go to the hospital, so the police did not compel them to go.

(*b*) The District Magistrate satisfied himself by enquiry that the report of the incident sent by the police was correct. No public enquiry was made.

(*c*) A copy [a] of Mr. Pai's letter is laid on the table. No certificates were given by the medical officer. The accident register shows that the two persons received 49 and 20 contusions respectively.

(*d*) Instructions have been issued that no more force should be used in the dispersal of crowds than is necessary to effect dispersal.

Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt:—" With reference to clause (*b*), may I know whether the District Magistrate held any enquiry and examined Dr. Pai, the complainant or anybody else?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—" I cannot say. But I may say one thing that the general conduct of the police in South Kanara is now under enquiry by the Inspector-General. There are also certain cases pending in law courts. When all these are over, Government will consider whether any action is necessary."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—" Do the Government consider the volunteers receiving 20 and 49 contused wounds, respectively, a reasonable use of force?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—" Whatever the Government may or may not consider, I have already said that the Government have ordered an enquiry into the matter. When the report is received we will consider whether any action is necessary. In the meantime the District Superintendent of Police has been transferred and we have posted an experienced District Superintendent of Police. Everything is quiet now."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—" May I know who is going to hold the enquiry and whether evidence will be taken from people who are willing to tender evidence?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"The Inspector-General of Police is making a departmental enquiry."

B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur:—"Will the enquiry be a public one?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"It is a departmental enquiry."

Alleged beating of picketers on 4th May 1932 at Bezwada.

* 82 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that on 4th May 1932 the volunteers who were picketing foreign cloth shops peacefully with national flags in Bezwada were escorted by the sergeant and the police to the Krishna river bund and detained there till about 11 a.m. and then subjected to a severe cane and lathi charge;

(*b*) whether Balipalli Appalaswami and others who had so received injuries are treated in the Peoples Hospital; if so, whether the hon. the Home Member will be pleased to call for a statement from the medical officer in charge of the hospital regarding the number and the nature of their injuries and place them on the table of the House; and

(*c*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*c*) The Government have no information but have called for a report.

Mr. G. SIMHACHALAM PANTULU:—"Have the Government received the information at least now?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"No, Sir."

Alleged petition to the Collector of South Kanara, dated 21st May 1932, regarding police excesses.

* 83 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Mr. K. Sundara Rao, B.A., LL.B., and several others sent a statement or a petition, dated 21st May 1932, to the Collector of South Kanara detailing the excesses committed by the police and the forest guards on the Congress volunteers who went to break the Forest Laws in the Herur Reserve Forest of Coondapoor taluk on 16th May 1932; if so, whether the hon. the Home Member will be pleased to place a copy of the same on the table of the House;

(*b*) whether the Collector of South Kanara enquired into the said petition; if so, what the result of the same is; and on whose evidence the enquiry is based; and

(*c*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

[3rd August 1932

A.—(*a*) *to* (*c*) The Government have no information but have called for it.

Alleged ill-treatment of forest satyagrahis in Herur forest.

* 84 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether on 16th May 1932 one Laxminarayanamurti, the standard bearer of the forest satyagrahis of Herur forest, Coondapoor taluk, was given about ten or twelve blows with the flagstaff which the boy had carried;

(*b*) whether one Balagone Venkataramana Hebbar who was another of the said satyagrahis was given two blows on the head with cudgel and whether, when his clothes were besmeared with blood resulting from the wounds caused on the head, the police removed all the clothes from his body and took them away; and

(*c*) whether it is a fact that one Karyavirya Subba and another who accidentally happened to come to the said place of forest satyagrahis was beaten and whether the former's clothes were also removed and torn?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*c*) The Government have no information but have called for it.

Alleged arrest of forest satyagrahis in Herur forest.

* 85 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) when were the 23 forest satyagrahis arrested for satyagraha in the Herur forest in Coondapoor taluk on 16th May 1932 and when were they charged or released;

(*b*) whether they were given any food on 16th May 1932 when they were in Kirimanyeswar school or later in the night when they were brought to the Baindur lock-up;

(*c*) whether the police gave them any food between the 17th and 20th May 1932 when they were in Baindur lock-up;

(*d*) whether any medical assistance was given to the satyagrahis; if so, when;

(*e*) whether it is a fact that as the police did not give them any food the people of Baindur, out of pity, served food to the arrested prisoners in the Baindur lock-up between the 17th and 20th May 1932; and

(*f*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*f*) The Government have no information but have called for it.

Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt:—" When the Government receive the information, will they be pleased to place it on the table of the House? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—
" The suggestion will be considered after we receive the report."

Police

Number, nature and disposal of complaints against police officers.

* 86 *Q.*—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number, nature and disposal of complaints against policemen or officers with their names and designations either to the department or to the courts of justice by private individuals in the years 1931 and 1932 till the month of June; and

(*b*) the occasions when judicial officers of the Government have criticized or animadverted on the action of particular police officers and the action which the department or the Government have taken on those officers?

A.—The information is not available. It will take time and involve much labour to collect the information as a large number of officers must be addressed.

Police help to the Zamindar of Udaiyarpalaiyam.

* 87 *Q.*—Mr. V. T. ARASU: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that a posse of thirty reserve constables were stationed in the Udaiyarpalaiyam zamindari for about a fortnight in the month of June last;

(*b*) whether they were going about the villages of the zamindari accompanied by the zamindar's band and the zamindari officials, striking terror into the hearts of the ryots;

(*c*) the reason or reasons which prompted the District Superintendent of Police to extend this kind of help to the zamindar; and

(*d*) whether the zamindar has made any contribution to the Government for this help which they have been pleased to render him, and if so, how much?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*d*) Government have received a report from the District Magistrate of Trichinopoly to the effect that Police assistance was given to the Zamindar of Udayarpalayam in June last during the collection of rents from zamindari tenants, but that no force was used by the Police party. Further information on the points raised has been called for.

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"May I know when the police force in this Presidency was transformed into an agency for the collection of the kists of the zamindar?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"There has been no such transformation. In this case the District Collector thought that the zamindar was entitled to police aid and he was given it."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"On what grounds did the District Collector think that the zamindar was entitled to police aid?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
"As I have said, I have given all the information that I have. I shall call for further information."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"What are the special reasons that have led the District Collector of Trichinopoly to be so very much obliging to the zamindar?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
"I shall enquire."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Is it the policy or the intention of the Government to give such police aid to any person who desires to collect his rent from his ryot or tenant?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
"I have nothing to add to what I have already said."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I ask whether the Government are aware that the relationships between the Zamindar of Udayarpalayam and his tenants are strained and whether they will take steps to make them more cordial?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
"I am afraid I cannot answer the question."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Will the Government be pleased to appoint a committee to go into this question of the relationship between the zamindar not only of Udayarpalayam but of other zamindars also and their tenants?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"That does not arise."

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS

Agriculture

Cattle breeding stations in the Presidency.

88 *Q.*—Mr. K. SINGAM AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government are aware of any cattle breeding institutions working in the Presidency; and

(*b*) if so, their names and addresses?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) There is a Government Cattle Farm at Hosur. There is also a well-known private cattle breeding farm at Palayakottai in the Coimbatore district belonging to the Pattagar of Palayakottai.

Famine Insurance Fund

Utilization of the Famine Relief Fund.

89 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the amount available is under the Famine Relief Fund;

(*b*) whether the Government will place on the table the reply received to the communication addressed by them to the Government of India about utilizing the Famine Insurance Fund; and

(*c*) whether the difficulties in the working of the Famine Code were ever brought to the attention of the Government of India?

A.—(*a*) According to the latest information available the balance in the Famine Relief Fund on the 31st March 1932 is Rs. 54·58 lakhs.

(*b*) No communication was addressed by this Government to the Government of India about utilizing the Famine Relief Fund.

(*c*) The Government do not know what the difficulties in the working of the Famine Code to which the hon. Member refers are.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the member.]

II.—HOUSE COMMITTEE.

* The hon. the President:—"I have to inform the House that the following eight candidates were nominated for election to the House Committee:—

(1) Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan.

(2) Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.

(3) Mr. V. T. Arasu.

(4) Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao.

(5) Mr. F. G. Luker.

(6) Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.

(7) Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.

(8) Mr. T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.

"Of these Messrs. V. T. Arasu and F. G. Luker have withdrawn their candidature.

"As the remaining number of candidates nominated for election is equal to the number of vacancies to be filled, namely, six, I hereby declare them duly elected.

"In addition to the above I nominate under Standing Order 84—

(1) Mr. F. G. Luker

(2) Mr. H. M. Jagannatham

to be Members of the said Committee.

"The Deputy President is ex officio Chairman of the Committee."

[3rd August 1932

NON-OFFICIAL BUSINESS.

Bills.

III.—THE TIRUMALAI-TIRUPATI DEVASTHANAMS BILL.

* Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, I beg to present the *Report of the Select Committee on the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill (Bill No. 15 of 1931) and move—

'*that the Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration*'."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU:—"I second it."

* Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Sir, at the outset I must apologize for giving the impression that I am intent on postponing all matters to the next meeting of the Council. But when I am able to show to the House that sufficient time has not been given for a proper consideration of such an important measure as the one now before the House, I am sure they will agree with me that I am doing the right thing when I move the adjournment of the consideration of this Bill. I have often been told in private that I, as a Mussalman, have nothing to do with the Tirumalai-Tirupati Bill. It is true that I am not a visitor to that temple or a devotee of the deity there; it may be that I have no religious interest in the administration or the mal-administration of the devasthanams and its endowments. But all the same I have my responsibility as a Member of this House and I have my own ideas as to how religious endowments ought to be administered generally. I would be failing in my duty if I did not bring home to hon. Members that any hasty or hurried legislation will not ultimately prove beneficial to the interests that are sought to be served by it. Of course the Select Committee took a long time over the Bill and at one time it was rumoured that owing to several difficulties the Bill could not be taken up in this Council. Several of us ignored the rumour but belief in it was strengthened by the fact that notice of motion for consideration of the Bill was not given till a few days ago. That being the case several of us interested in this measure have not been able to devote sufficient time and attention to this important Bill. It is a complicated Bill and it seeks to bring into existence a machinery the implications of which are far-reaching. It encroaches on the rights of the present trustee and brings into existence various committees for managing the devasthanams. In some cases their jurisdiction is co-extensive or co-terminous, I cannot say which. The Bill has been before us only for three or four days. Nothing will be lost by postponing the consideration of this measure for a month or two, especially in view of the bitter experience we have had of hurried legislation in the past. Hon. Members who are anxious to get this Bill through can at any time apply to His Excellency through the hon. the Chief Minister and have a special meeting of the Council to consider this question. The fact that hon. Members of this House have not had sufficient time to study this subject is shown by the fact that there

* Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 12th July 1932.

3rd August 1932] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

is not a single amendment to the motion now before the House. Are we to take it that the measure as it has come out of the Select Committee is so satisfactory to all the parties concerned that they have not thought it necessary to amend it? Is it as perfect as the law of Solon of olden days and should be passed into an Act straightaway? Besides, I am not sure that the Government themselves are prepared to take the Bill into consideration. I doubt very much whether the hon. the Chief Minister in the midst of his various duties has been able to devote the necessary time and attention for this question. For these reasons I move—

> '*that the consideration of this Bill be adjourned to the next meeting of the Council or to some date which may be fixed for the purpose by His Excellency*.'"

Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar:—" Sir, I beg to second the adjournment motion. In doing so I desire to point out that we have had bitter experience of hurried legislation in the past. Only now we are trying to remedy the defects in the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act. These defects would not have crept in if we had been careful in the beginning not to rush the Bill through. Even the Hindu Religious Endowments Act is defective. It was only yesterday that the hon. the Chief Minister admitted that it was not possible to give effect to various clauses in the Act where district committees could not function. And for want of finance district committees could not be formed. We wanted some legislation and we got it. We created a few bodies here and there. It is not as though we considered the subject well and passed a Bill to deal with the matter. If hon. Members are sure that the Bill, as it has come out of the Select Committee, is so perfect that there is no need to touch it, if they are unanimously of that opinion, then I think it would be right to pass it at once. As the hon. the Mover of the adjournment motion pointed out there is no amendment on the paper and can it be taken to show that the Bill has attained such a perfect shape in the hands of the Select Committee that it is not necessary to change one syllable or one word in it? I cannot imagine that this House could have come to such a unanimous conclusion on a matter on which there was so much controversy only the other day when the Bill was introduced. I therefore feel strongly that, unless the House felt there was no need to touch the Select Committee's report, the consideration of the matter should be adjourned."

* The hon. the President:—" The question is that the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill as reported on by the Select Committee be adjourned to the next meeting of the Council or to some date which may be fixed for the purpose by His Excellency."

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro:—" Mr. President, Sir, it seems to 11
be the peculiar privilege of the hon. Mover of this motion, to ask a.
always for the adjournment of any proposal coming before this House. He is an advocate and he knows special pleading, and he could put forward plausible grounds. Nevertheless, he has not been able to make

out a case for himself. I am sure that, if he searches his heart, he will find that there is no ground for making this motion. I can account for his motion in one way; he is a very busy lawyer and he might not have had sufficient time to study the details of this Bill. Hon. Members know that this Bill passed through the Select Committee several weeks before and every one knows that the Select Committee has submitted its report. It is a unanimous report. It is singular and striking that there has not been any minute of dissent on the Bill from any Member of the Committee. The only note which the hon. Member, Mr. Koti Reddi, has made is a suggestion or improvement of detail and it does not affect the principles of this Bill or many details of this Bill. The fact that it has to be pleaded and advocated by a staunch Mussalman that this is a complicated measure (a measure affecting Hindu customs, Hindu rights and Hindu religious endowments) is really worthy of notice. The hon. Member, Mr. Basheer Ahmed, has the reputation of being a very staunch Mussalman. Apparently the hon. Member has begun to take interest in Hindu religious endowments as he was thoroughly ignorant of the administration or the ceremonials or functions of these endowments. We must sympathize with the hon. Member. He takes very keen interest in any matter coming before him. He has had sufficient time to manifest his great interest in the cause of Hindus and in the management of Hindu religious endowments. The hon. Member may be satisfied with his arguments, but I think the other hon. Members of the House are not. One of the arguments urged by him was that no notice of amendments to this Bill has been given, in spite of the publication of the Report of the Select Committee. The very fact that hon. Members who take great interest did not deem it necessary to send a dissenting minute shows that this Bill does not at all require any further consideration. I said, the hon. Mover himself is not convinced of his position. But he, as a Muslim Member of this House, consciously feels that a measure affecting Hindu religious endowments should not be carried through without further consideration by him.

"The hon. Member who seconded this motion repeated the arguments of the hon. Mover and said that this House is guilty of hasty legislation in the past; he pointed out the instance of the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act. If I were in his position, I would not have given this instance. It is not fair to say that the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act was not well considered. This Bill, before it became an Act, was before the country for several months. We all realize now that there have been practical difficulties in the actual working of the Act and therefore we want further modifications and further changes. There was nothing like hasty legislation in the matter of the passing of that Act. It was fully considered by all persons interested in the Bill and after full discussion in this House that Bill was passed into law. When the hon. Seconder cited this instance, he gave up his case entirely. There is absolutely no reason for saying that this is a case of hasty legislation. I would remind the hon. the Seconder of this motion that in the case of the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act,

3rd August 1932] [Sir A. P. Patro]

there were many amendments running to several pages. Although that Bill was fully considered, some hon. Members feel now that there are some defects in the actual working of the Act and they want to remedy them. I understand that the Local Self-Government Advisory Committee desire that that Act should be amended. The Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill has been before the public for a very long time and it has been considered several times. This Bill has come before the House from the Select Committee and I think that the time is ripe for the consideration of this Bill."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—" Sir, I beg to move an amendment to the motion of my hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed. It runs as follows:—

> 'Delete *all words after the word* " *adjourned* " *and* insert *the words* " *to another available non-official day during this meeting of the Council as the first item* ".'

" My reason for proposing this amendment is this. There is a feeling among some hon. Members that they have had no time to consider this important Bill. If it is indefinitely postponed, I think it will not satisfy all the Members of the House. Hon. Members desire that this Bill should be considered as quickly as possible. The Select Committee has gone into the Bill, and submitted its report, and we are anxious that this legislation should be placed on the statute book. I think that it will give general satisfaction—and I think my hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed, would also agree—if one or two days' extra time is given so that hon. Members will have time to study the Report of the Select Committee and to give notice of the necessary amendments, which would, in their opinion, perfect the measure and which would make the Bill acceptable to the House. I hope that this amendment of mine will receive general acceptance."

Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar:—" I second the motion."

* Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—" Sir, I should not object to the Bill being taken up day after to-morrow. I only want that we should be sure of the work being finished. Supposing that, for any reason, we are not able to finish the consideration of the Bill on that particular day, may I know, whether the Government would be so good as to allow the Bill to be taken up on the following day, so that we might finish the consideration of the Bill at this sitting? Otherwise, we would be putting off the Bill indefinitely as we heard yesterday that there will be no meeting of the Council till November. I think it is hardly fair either to this House or to the public that the consideration of this Bill should be indefinitely put off."

* The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—" Sir, His Excellency has allotted two days for non-official business. I think that it is better that we should finish the consideration of this Bill as early as possible. I do not think there is any possibility of any other non-official day being allotted."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Sir, in supporting the amendment moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, I wish to say that this Bill had a very chequered career. The report of the Select Committee had a very chequered career in the Secretariat and we did not know that this report will be placed before the Council during this session, till yesterday. It seems that the Secretariat was not quite sure whether certain sections of the Bill required the sanction of His Excellency the Viceroy or not. I do not know whether the Secretariat was right or not. On account of that fact, it was not possible for your office to include this item in the agenda early enough . . ."

12 noon. * The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I wish to correct the hon. Member. A notice was circulated on the 12th July to hon. Members that this item would be included in the list of business. I do not think the hon. Member is correct in saying that no notice was given to hon. Members from the Legislative Council office. It was also included in the list of business issued yesterday—the only list of business issued for to-day."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Subsequent to the date of issue of notice, dated 12th July, it was considered that that notice was not valid notice, because the Secretariat was of opinion that the consent of His Excellency the Viceroy was necessary to certain clauses of the Bill. On account of that fact, the Council office had to withdraw this item of business. This item was not included in the agenda issued subsequent to 12th July. This was sprung upon the House yesterday.

" Only yesterday it was sprung upon this House suddenly. And what surprised me most was how items which come later take precedence in the agenda. As a matter of fact, we received a printed agenda in which we did not find this item. This item was given to hon. Members of this House on a typed sheet, and to-day I find that it takes precedence over other measures which occupied the first places on the agenda . . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" May I inform the hon. Member that matters which have gone through the Select Committees and which are ripe for consideration by this House are placed first on the agenda and that as this Bill has gone through the Select Committee and the Select Committee's report is available, and therefore ripe for consideration, it is placed first on the agenda before this House? There was no agenda issued before yesterday. And this item was included in that agenda. It is not an item which is subject to the rules as to ballot."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Even in such circumstances, I thought the report on the Medical Registration Bill would come first and this Bill would come later; but I see that somehow or other this has been given precedence over even that Bill."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" These Bills are earlier Bills in point of date. So under the Standing Orders, they get precedence."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Anyhow, apart from that, Sir, there is a feeling in the House that this measure should not be hurried through. Certainly, we are prepared to see that it is passed in this sitting of the House; but we do not want to have any dilatory motion

3rd August 1932] [Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan]

in order to see that this is put off indefinitely. We want to see that it is passed; but at the same time, Members of the Select Committee and Members of Government will kindly admit that we, as Members of this House, should also have an opportunity to go through the report fully before we are asked to give our votes one way or the other.

"Then, Sir, I cannot understand the attitude of the Government in this matter. If they really believe that this is a very very important measure and that it should not be put off to a later date or indefinitely, the Government should come down and say, 'we shall give one more day.' I cannot understand the attitude of Government with regard to this measure. Either they do not think it is an important measure, or they should be prepared to get it through by giving us another non-official day. Therefore, Sir, I heartily support the adjournment motion and I believe hon. Members of this House will not overlook the fact that there are Members in this House who were not in a position to go through the report before to-day as they were not sure that this Bill would come up before this House in this meeting, and that at least a day's time should be given to them so that they may come prepared to give their vote either this way or that way, honestly and properly."

* Mr. K. Koti Reddi:—"Mr. President, Sir, I oppose this adjournment motion. I wish the Government were in a position to allot one more day; but since we are not assured of that, it seems to me that it is better we go on with the Bill immediately. Sir, I am one of those who have given notice that this Bill should be taken up to-day. Certainly, we are not anxious to rush through this Bill, but when we see that the Select Committee's report is practically unanimous—there was only a minute of dissent by me which does not go into the principles of the Bill but deals with a matter of detail—and that the Council has had an opportunity of going through it to-day and considering any amendments that might be given notice of—in fact I find that no amendments have been so far tabled—Members should have taken it for granted that this Bill would be taken up for consideration at this meeting. It is not a fact that most of the Members are not aware of what is being done with the Bill; they should certainly have studied the bill and sent in their notices of amendments. Seeing that there are no such notices, I really thought that the Bill as amended by the Select Committee would be taken up for consideration and that there would be no difficulty in getting it passed. We all know, Sir, this Bill has been hanging on for a very long time. The public were very much dissatisfied with the administration of this temple, and it took a very long time for the private Members of this Council to give notice of this Bill. For a long time we were thinking that the Government themselves would take steps to reform the administration of this temple; but seeing that the Government did not take any steps, the non-official Members had to come in with their Bills. The Select Committee took evidence and received some memoranda on this matter. I do not know how many times the Select Committee sat, but they sat a number of times and after so much delay and consideration, they have made this

report. The result is that the Bill has been amended to a very large extent. I do not think we are really rushing through this Bill now; but if we postpone it now, the public who have been all along eagerly and anxiously waiting to see some reform carried out in the temple administration, will be dissatisfied. I think we will be serving the public interests if we see that this Bill is taken up straightaway now and considered."

* Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, I must emphatically repudiate the suggestion made by certain hon. Members that this particular piece of legislation is being hurried through. As a matter of fact, this legislation is rather very slow and gradual. That is my grievance. If I place certain facts about it before the House, it will be clearly seen how gradual the progress of this legislation has been. The Members of the Select Committee were appointed on the 31st October 1931, and the Select Committee first met on 3rd November 1931; again they met from 11th to 15th December 1931 and then on the 5th, 7th and 8th January 1932. Finally, they met on the 4th July 1932 and made their final report. The report, Sir, as amended by the Select Committee, was published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* about two or three weeks ago. Therefore, Sir, it cannot be suggested that this legislation is being rushed through.

"With regard to the suggestion made that there was some difficulty in the matter of getting the sanction of the Governor-General of India, I may state that the movers of the Bill applied through the Local Self-Government Department of this Government to the Government of India for the sanction of the Governor-General for a particular clause and for the Bill as a whole as amended by the Select Committee. I understand that intimation was received from the Government of India yesterday that sanction has been given for the whole Bill as amended by the Select Committee. So, Sir, there is no difficulty as to the question of sanction by the Governor-General. I do not think that any objection can be raised on this account. But owing to some misapprehension or mistake, this subject was sought to be taken off the agenda. Soon after the mistake was found out, this subject was placed on the agenda. The Bill has been before hon. Members of the Council for a sufficiently long time, and if any hon. Member was interested in the Bill, he could have sent in his amendments, because he had ample time. As a matter of fact, in the case of other Bills, amendments were handed over even on the very day the Bill was taken up for discussion. So, I do not see any reason why that objection should be trotted out now.

"Then, with regard to the adjournment motion, Sir—both the adjournment *sine die* and adjournment to the next non-official day—I may say that if the Government will assure us that they will certainly give us sufficient time to see that the Bill is passed, I have no objection to an adjournment for a short period; but if that assurance is not forthcoming, I must say that we must proceed with the Bill now, because it

3rd August 1932]

*Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" Mr. President, Sir, as a Member of the Select Committee, I feel no hesitation whatsoever in saying that the Bill should be taken up for consideration at once. But I must complain against the manner in which this business is rushed. Till yesterday we had absolutely no inkling of the probability of this Bill coming up for consideration to-day. I agree there has been a notice given to hon. Members of this House that this will be one of the items for this meeting; but subsequently, news appeared, which was not contradicted—and I dare say that that news must have emanated from one of the departments—that the Bill would not be taken up now on account of some technical objections, viz., that the sanction of the Government of India was necessary. No contradiction was made of that news, and I suppose you cannot complain against hon. Members if they took that news to be authoritative. That news was further corroborated by the fact that in the agenda paper originally drafted, there was no mention of the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill being taken up now. It was subsequently that a roneoed paper was attached to the printed agenda. This also shows that the department concerned was not so sure that this Bill would be taken up to-day, and so hon. Members have not sent in amendments. Now Government would not agree to extend this meeting by a day to see to the passing of this Bill. That is only in conformity with their attitude not to allot sufficient time for transacting non-official business. But that apart, if the hon. the President would be willing to suspend the Standing Order with regard to notice of amendments, having special regard to the fact that the Government would not give another day for this purpose, we have no other alternative left but to go on with this business."

Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Sir, speaking on the amendment of my hon. Friend Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the changes that have been made in the Select Committee. The hon. Member for Ganjam referred to the fact that it was such a good measure, that it had the unanimous support of the Select Committee and that it comes to this House as a measure which ought to be accepted without any discussion, as it were. And in support of that, he said that the fact that there were no amendments given notice of, showed that the Bill was a very good one. May I draw the attention of the hon. Member for Ganjam to the Bill as it was originally introduced in this House and to that as amended by the Select Committee? I would ask the hon. Member for Ganjam and other hon. Members of this House if they can see the original Bill in any form after it emerged out of the Select Committee. I find from the Bill of the Select Committee that the changes made are so great that the big pica printing that is used for denoting changes occupies almost the whole of each and every page. You will find that very few lines or perhaps very few words even, are the same as they were in the original Bill. Does it show that the Select Committee has agreed with the views of the Council at the time the Bill was originally brought before this House? "

Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO :—" The whole Bill has been properly

Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar:—" So much wisdom has now been claimed for the Select Committee that it is said that the Select Committee's improvement of the Bill is so great that the Bill as originally drafted and introduced in this House cannot be recognized in its original form at all after it emerged from the Select Committee. Does it show that the framers of the Bill badly drafted it then and that, therefore, it could not be passed by this House as it was? We also see from the speeches of the hon. Members who sat in the Select Committee that it is a case of out-heroding Herod. They say, they are very anxious that the Bill should be got through and that no further notice is necessary. Perhaps, so far as they are concerned, no further notice is necessary because they were Members of the Select Committee posted with all the information; they attended the Select Committee meetings and knew what the Bill is in its present form. But, can they not give credit to other Members when they want to find out what the changes are and whether such changes are for the better or for the worse ? It is not my object here to stand up on behalf of a dilatory motion. I am as anxious as every other Member of this House that this Bill, when once it has come before this House after going through the Select Committee stage, should receive early consideration. But what I am surprised at is that no chance is given to hon. Members to study the subjects before they are passed. I refer to the passing of another Bill. It was only yesterday I think that because we had not enough time and the Council was not likely to meet before November or December, we were perforce obliged to come to a decision on the Orissa Report. It is a question of our being asked: 'now or never; when things are placed before you, give your decision immediately; it may be wrong or it may be right, but we want an immediate decision.' I would ask hon. Members whether that is the right attitude which a Legislative Council should take, especially after the experience we have had in respect of other Bills. It should not be difficult, with due deference to the hon. the Leader of the House, for us to get another day. After all, the Legislative Council is anxious to do its duty, and if we ask for a day's adjournment, it is not because we want to put off things indefinitely. We are anxious that the Bill should be considered fairly and well and that the considered decision of the Legislative Council should be given. Why this unseemly hurrying through and then finding out that we have gone wrong? After all, one or two days' postponement is not going to affect the merits of the Bill."

2-15 p.m. Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur:—" Mr. President, Sir, I move—

'that the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill, as reported by the Select Committee, be circulated for public opinion'."

The motion was duly seconded.

* The hon. the President:—" The motion is—

'that the Bill, as reported by the Select Committee, be circulated for public opinion.'

" That motion also is now for discussion."

* Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—" Sir, I oppose this motion as well as the other motion for adjournment that

3rd August 1932] [Mr. C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar]

the Bill be taken up at the next meeting or to have it taken up in February or March. As it is, it is very unfortunate that such amendments should have been moved from the other side by prominent members of one community. It so happens that this motion for adjournment was moved by Mr. Basheer Ahmed and seconded by Mr. Hameed Khan (Voices: No, no, by Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar). Then, Sir, this motion for circulation for eliciting public opinion has been moved by another member of the Muslim community. We, most of the members of the Hindu community, have got considerable misgivings that if this is not taken up immediately there is every danger of the measure being postponed indefinitely. I strongly urge that this Bill should be taken up immediately. As hon. Members of the House know, we have taken evidence also at great length on this measure and as my hon. Friend Mr. Manikkavelu Nayakar pointed out, it is also noted in the report of the Select Committee. So, it cannot be said that it is being rushed through. On a perusal of the report of the Select Committee, it will be clear that the Committee sat for a number of days and it was presided over by no less a person than Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar. I appeal to every Member of the House to take up this question immediately."

* Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—" Sir, I do not want that hon. Members of this House should misunderstand the attitude taken up by certain sections of this House. When it is remembered, as Members of this House, every Member—I believe hon. Members on the opposite side of the House will concede—has a right to have recourse to all ways and means provided for by the rules and the standing orders governing the procedure in the Legislative Council, to see that when any Member of any section thereof feels that great injustice is likely to be done to a cause by hurried legislation of this kind for which there is no urgency pointed out so far, I do not think that there is any justice or fairplay on the part of hon. Members who oppose on the ground that the motion for adjournment or for circulation to elicit public opinion is moved by any motive or for other reasons. On the other hand, the Bill that was before the Select Committee is not the Bill that is now before the House. That would be very patent on a mere perusal of the report of the Select Committee and the Bill as reported upon by the Select Committee. It was within the province of the Select Committee, no doubt, to consider the principles that have been subscribed to by this House, and consistent with the principles that have been agreed to by this House, to so amend or alter the various clauses of the Bill as to carry out the intentions of the Legislature when the original Bill was sent on to the Select Committee.

" Now, Sir, I ask whether hon. Members will be able to say that the Bill and the principles as were referred to the Select Committee are the same as they are now? Not in the least. Every clause has undergone a change not merely in the form but in the substance and in the spirit. I do not think that the Select Committee had any justification in changing the principles that were subscribed to by this House. On the other hand, they should have kept themselves

in accordance with the principles that were agreed to and subscribed to by this Council and not gone about making changes as they have done. Even supposing for a moment that the Select Committee has carried out the principles that were agreed to by this House, I would only ask hon. Members whether it is not fair or reasonable that time should be given for public opinion to settle on the great issues that have been raised in this Bill.

"The Select Committee have, in section 1, stated that they have extended the principles of this Bill to the educational institutions specified in Schedule II. That was not the object of this Council at all when the Bill was referred to them and now when such an important extension has been made, is it not fair that the public also should have sufficient time given to them in order to settle its opinion on a question like this? Again, Sir, if you go through the second sub-clause of clause 2 of the Bill, it says that the Tirupati Devasthanams Schools Act of 1914 is hereby repealed. This was not originally included in the Bill that was referred to the Select Committee. Then again, Sir, there are various other variations from the original Bill. For instance, the constitution of the Committee has been thoroughly changed and that was not exactly the purpose with which this Bill was brought into existence before it was referred to the Select Committee. If you go through the other clauses, you will find that the whole Bill has been altered to the very foundations. Even granting that it was right, why not the public and those other bodies which are interested in a legislation of this kind be given an opportunity to express their opinion on the various alterations made by the Select Committee?

"After all, Sir, what is the time that has elapsed between the republication of this Bill and its introduction to-day for being taken into consideration? Not even a full month has elapsed since the Bill was republished. I would therefore say that at least now, if hon. Members, who are really representing constituencies to which they hold themselves responsible, are going to do justice to their constituencies, it is but right on their part that the public should be allowed an opportunity to express what exactly their opinion is on the drastic changes made in the Bill by the Select Committee.

"So far, to my knowledge, nothing seems to have taken place in connexion with this amended Bill in any public meeting or association or by any public body. But there is no material to show that the public has taken into consideration the Bill as reported upon and amended by the Select Committee. In the absence of any opinion from the public, it is but reasonable that this Bill should be circulated for eliciting public opinion and after that we should take the Bill into consideration and nothing will be lost until that is done. After all, this is an important measure seeking to restrict the liberties of certain people, seeking to nullify the various schemes, seeking to reconstitute the whole administration and attempting to do so many other things. So, the public have every right to say what they have to

say *on* the Bill, and the only method by which public opinion can be elicited will be by deferring the consideration of this Bill."

* Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar:—" Mr. President, Sir, I am sorry that a motion like this should have been brought forward by my hon. Friend Mr. Basheer Ahmed to adjourn the discussion of this matter and also that he should have thought it fit to support it by reference to high principles which, to my humble intelligence, do not seem to apply to this case. Sir, this is a Bill which evoked a lot of attention in the country and up to almost the day on which we published the report of the Select Committee, there were meetings and representations sent by various people and by various other associations. If I remember aright, even at the last meeting of the Select Committee, we received some representations with reference to what ought to be put in the Bill, but the moment the Select Committee reported and the report was published in the papers, there was no sort of representation, no sort of public agitation and no sort of protest anywhere. If this means anything, it can only mean that in spite of the very strong and very widespread interest the matter evoked, this Bill as amended has met with approval of most of the people concerned and that is why we have not heard any protest or representation of any sort with reference to the Bill after the report of the Select Committee was published. The report of the Select Committee and the Bill, as amended by it, were published in the Gazette on the 12th July and it is now three weeks since its re-publication. (Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Is that enough?) Sir, during all these three weeks, I have been noting whether there was any reference to the Bill as amended by the Select Committee either in the papers or in any proceedings of any meetings which have been held. On the other hand, it is a matter of some gratification that our labours in the Select Committee have met with the general approval of the people and that there is not even correspondence in the papers attacking the provisions of the amended Bill. Such being the case, for anybody to come to the Council and say, 'this is a very important Bill, it has gone through several amendments in the Select Committee, and so its progress ought to be adjourned again,' seems to me to talk without brief. If really there were some objections raised by people elsewhere and if any Member comes to the House and says, there have been objections to the Bill and that the House should consider all of them, I can quite understand the position, but when there is absolutely no sort of protest or objection in the Press or on the platforms with reference to this Bill as amended, for a Member to come and say 'I failed to read the Bill, not because notice was not given to me about it, not because the Select Committee report and the amended Bill were not circulated to me, but because I was under the impression that on account of something which appeared in the Press that the Bill may not come up before this meeting and on that account it ought to be postponed' seems to me is not a fair way of asking for the postponement of the Bill. Sir, in view of what some of the Members said that they were misled by something that appeared in the papers and that they might not have read the Bill and the

[Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar] [3rd August 1932

report of the Select Committee, I thought the Government might have consented to allot some more time and allowed the Bill to be taken up to-morrow, but seeing the attitude of the Government and seeing that they are not prepared to give another day if necessary for the consideration of the Bill, I think we have to press the original motion (*Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan: 'Is the Opposition to swallow that?'*) Whether you swallow it or not, nothing can be done. We know the Government is unreasonable, but that is no reason why we should not go through the Bill. Sir, this measure has been before the country for the last 15 months and such being the case, I do not think we will be justified in postponing its consideration still further, in this case, for three months more. This is practically the chief work for this session if I can see aright, and we will not be justified in postponing it altogether. For these reasons, I support the original motion for taking this into consideration and oppose the motion for adjournment."

12-30 p.m. * The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"Mr. President, Sir, this is a Bill which has been given notice of by Members on both sides of the House. In the Select Committee also, all the parties have been represented and particularly the Hindu section have been unanimous, as also my hon. Friend Mr. Yakub Hasan and Mr. Yahya Ali who also participated in the Committee. Two days have been allotted by His Excellency for non-official work and it is more than sufficient, as is evident from the Bill itself, when both sections are agreed to the provisions of it, to get through the Bill in two days. I should even consider one day is sufficient. The objection taken, namely, that Government are unreasonable in not giving another day is, I think, not justifiable. (Laughter.) (Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: It was not intended against you.) Far from it, if only the non-official Members would agree to see the Bill passed, I cannot see why it cannot be passed in one day, or at the most two days. And if that too is not found enough it might be taken on another non-official day. I see there is unanimity of opinion in this House that the Bill should be taken up in this sitting itself. So, I don't agree to the adjournment of the consideration of this Bill."

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, the amendment that I proposed was not with a view to postpone the Bill indefinitely, but only to see that the opinion of the House is given adequate expression in this matter. If the matter is one of choice, I should prefer to take up the Bill immediately. I think Government are not reasonable in not giving an extra day, if necessary. In fact this Bill might become a controversial measure although there is unanimity with regard to its being taken up immediately, for it might easily provoke a great deal of opposition. So I am not sure whether one day would be sufficient. Even two days might not be sufficient. I think the distinction made between official days and non-official days, and official work and non-official work is most unreasonable. For, after all, what are the non-officials doing? We are only doing official work, and so why do you make a distinction between official days and non-official days and official work and non-official work? When you are not able to finish the official work in the number of allotted days,

3rd August 1932] [Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

are you not allotting an extra day? In the same way, why can't you allot to us an extra day if the non-official work is not finished within the prescribed time? I think Government are unreasonable in this. Mr. President, I don't wish to press my amendment; I beg to withdraw it.''

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—'' The question is—

' *that the Bill as reported on by the Select Committee be circulated for public opinion* '.''

The amendment was lost.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—'' I will now put the motion of Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed to the vote of the House. (After a pause.) The question is—

' *that the consideration of the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill be adjourned to the next meeting of the Council or to some date which may be fixed for the purpose by His Excellency* '.''

The amendment was declared lost. Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed demanded a poll and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

1. Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
2. ,, Basheer Ahmed Sayeed.
3. Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.

Noes.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur.
2. ,, Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
3. ,, Sir Archibald Campbell.
4. ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
5. ,, Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
6. ,, Mr. P. T. Rajan.
7. ,, Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
8. Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
9. Mr. C. E. Jones.
10. ,, J. A. Thorne.
11. ,, H. M. Hood.
12. ,, R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
13. ,, S. H. Slater.
14. ,, E. Conran Smith.
15. ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
16. Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.
17. Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
18. ,, K. P. Raman Menon.
19. Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam.
20. Mr. K. C. M. Venkatachalam Reddiyar.
21. ,, G. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
22. ,, M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.
23. Rao Sahib N. Siva Rai.
24. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
25. Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
26. ,, M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar.
27. Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
28. Mr. M. S. Sreshta.
29. ,, P. C. Moses.
30. ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
31. ,, P. Bayappa Reddi.
32. ,, R. M. Palat.
33. Rao Bahadur R. K. Venugopal Nayudu.
34. Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
35. The Raja of Bobbili.
36. The Raja of Kallikote.
37. The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.
38. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
39. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
40. ,, A. V. Bhanoji Rao.
41. ,, J. A. Davis.
42. ,, Daniel Thomas.
43. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
44. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
45. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanya Chetti.
46. The Zamindar of Kirlampudi.
47. *Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu.*
48. The Zamindar of Chemudu.
49. Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami.
50. ,, K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu.
51. Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.
52. Dr. P. Subbarayan.
53. *Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.*
54. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
55. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
56. Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
57. Rao Bahadur T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
58. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur.

[3rd August 1932

Noes—cont.

59. Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar.
60. ,, M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
61. ,, A. B. Shetty.
62. ,, G. Simhachalam Pantulu.
63. ,, Abdul Hameed Khan.
64. The Pattagar of Palayakottai.
65. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
66. ,, K. Koti Reddi.
67. Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi.
68. Mr. J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
69. ,, C. Satyanarayana Choudari.
70. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
71. The Maharaja of Venkatagiri.
72. Mr. C. Basu Dev.
73. Rao Sahib D. Krishnamurti.
74. Mr. V. T. Arasu.
75. ,, G. Sriramulu.
76. ,, H. M. Jagannatham.
77. Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
78. Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan.
79. Mr. G. R. Premayya.
80. ,, G. Lakshmana Reddi.
81. ,, C. Krishnan.
82. ,, P. Peddi Raju.
83. ,, T. Narasa Reddi.

Neutral.

1. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.
2. Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur.
3. Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
4. ,, K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.
5. ,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
6. ,, F. G. Luker.
7. Mr. A. W. Hutton.
8. ,, F. Birley.
9. ,, F. G. Stanes.
10. ,, F. E. James.
11. S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.
12. Mr. M. P. Madhusoodhanan Thangal.

Ayes 3; *Noes* 83; *Neutral* 12.

The amendment was lost.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Mr. President, Sir, I move—

'*this question be taken up for consideration soon after the lunch hour*'."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" In order to facilitate giving notice of amendments, if any."

Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" On a point of order, Sir, may I know whether it is possible for hon. Members to give notice of amendments now ? "

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" It is possible to give notice."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I think it is possible to accept notice of amendments.

" The question is—

'*that the consideration of the Bill be taken up as the first item in the afternoon after lunch*'."

The motion was carried.

IV.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS MEDICAL REGISTRATION ACT, 1914 (BILL No. 28 OF 1932).

Mr. DANIEL THOMAS :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to present the * Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to amend the Madras Medical Registration Act, 1914, and I move—

'*that the Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration.*'

" In doing so I wish to say a few words. The Government of Madras appointed a special committee in 1921 to go into the indigenous systems of medicine in this province. It was presided over by the present Home Member, and one of the unanimous recommendations of that committee was as follows :—

' The Medical Registration Act, Act IV of 1914, should be amended on the lines of section 26 (2) of the United Provinces Medical

* Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 21st June 1932.

3rd August 1932] [Mr. Daniel Thomas]

Registration Act so as to provide for free professional association between practitioners of the Indian and European systems of medicine.'

"The Bill now before us embodies that recommendation of the Committee. I would also invite the attention of the House to the fact that this Bill when originally introduced had the support of all sections of the House. The Select Committee have gone carefully into the provisions of the Bill and they have made certain modifications and changes, which, I submit, do not affect the principle underlying the Bill. They only introduce certain safeguards and make the application of certain sections more definite and precise. I, therefore, believe that the Bill as amended by the Select Committee is substantially the same as it was when originally introduced. I, therefore, commend the Bill to the consideration of the House."

Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur seconded the motion.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is—

'*that Bill No. 28 of 1932, as amended by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration*'."

The motion was carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will now put the several clauses of the Bill to the vote of the House. (After a pause.)

"The question is—

'*that clause 3 of the Bill be renumbered as clause 2*'."

The motion was carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is—

'*that the clauses 1 and 2 as renumbered do form part of the Bill*'."

The motion was carried.

The Preamble was put and carried.

Mr. DANIEL THOMAS:—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

'*that the Bill be passed into law.*'

"In this connexion I would offer my thanks to the Government for the cordial support they have given this measure, and I hope this measure will inaugurate a new era of cordial co-operation between the practitioners of Indian and European systems of medicine in the country and I hope that it will conduce to the greater welfare and better health of the huge masses of this province."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Mr. President, Sir, I second the motion. I join with my friend, Mr. Daniel Thomas, in congratulating the House on passing this measure which is of a very very vital character. It has brought into being a feeling of relief in the minds of a very large section of indigenous medical practitioners who are regarded more or less as untouchables. Now that we have passed this measure, we can henceforth recognize the medical men who are practising the indigenous systems.

[Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan] [3rd August 1932

45 m. "In our country, sir, there is great need for medical men. If we entirely depend upon the allopathic system a large proportion of our population will go without any medical aid. Now we have opened avenues for various systems to grow. I am glad that Mr. Daniel Thomas and Mr. Tajuddin are piloting this Bill and I am sure the people of this province will thank the Council for passing a measure of this nature."

* Mr. V. T. ARASU :—"I should like to associate myself with this motion, that the Bill be passed into law. All credit for the passing of this measure is due to Sir Mahomed Usman who is responsible for this Bill. It was he, during his non-official days, that agitated in this matter. And my friend Mr. Tajuddin has taken up the idea and has drafted it in the form of a Bill. I do not know why he did not think it fit to introduce the Bill himself. Sir, there is a provision in this Bill regarding which I should like to sound a note of warning to Government. There is a provision which defines a medical practitioner. It says: 'the expression "qualified practitioner" shall for purposes of this proviso mean "a practitioner qualified under rules made by the local Government in this behalf."' In framing rules and defining who a qualified medical practitioner is, great care should be taken to see that quacks are not included in the list. If possible, Government ought to constitute a committee to decide as to who are qualified and who are not. It is common knowledge that there are any number of Ayurvedic, Unani and Siddha practitioners throughout the length and breadth of this Presidency who are mere quacks and nothing more, and yet pass off for medical practitioners. This committee should exercise great care to see that such quacks are not included in the list and enabled to practise medicine either by themselves, or in association with registered medical practitioners.

"As regards sub-section (3) which runs as follows: "Nothing in sub-section (2) shall relieve a registered practitioner of any obligations or code of ethics which may be imposed upon registered practitioners generally by the Council." I have a few words to say: Sir, it would be remembered that according to the Medical Registration Act, a registered medical practitioner is prohibited from associating himself with one who is not registered under the Madras Medical Registration Act. By the Bill that we are now passing into law, it is sought to give permission to the registered practitioners to associate themselves with unregistered, but qualified, practitioners. That means to say there is scope for unscrupulous registered allopathic practitioners to associate with unregistered practitioners, and in their name carry on practice in a manner that would be against professional ethics. That is to say, whereas an unregistered practitioner is at liberty to advertise and seek clients, the registered practitioner is not able to do so at present. By passing this Bill into law you have enabled the registered practitioner to have as his assistant an unregistered practitioner and carry on his trade unscrupulously and unfairly. In regard to this also, I should think that Government should issue specific instructions to the Madras Medical Council to exercise great care and

3rd August 1932] [Mr. V. T. Arasu]

see that by means of this Act unscrupulous medical practitioners do not take undue advantage over the other medical practitioners by associating with them unregistered medical men. With these few words, I support the motion that this Bill be passed into law."

Khan Sahib SYED TAJUDDIN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Mr. President, Sir, the present amendment is not only a desideratum but a dire necessity. The section which prohibited medical practitioners from associating with unregistered practitioners was something like a blot on the Statute Book. The hon. Sir Mahomed Usman who himself comes from an eminent family of physicians found the injustice of it long ago and as the Chairman of the Committee entered a strong protest in his name. Some time elapsed before it struck me as well. I was not able to steer the Bill through this Council and Mr. Daniel Thomas was good enough to take the responsibility for piloting the Bill and he did not spare any pains to see that the Bill was passed into law. In this connexion, Sir, I have to thank first, the hon. Sir Mahomed Usman, secondly Mr. Daniel Thomas, then the members of the Select Committee and also the members of the House for their cordial support and encouragement. Mr. President, internationalism is the order of the day. Present day civilization entirely depends upon the continuous and slow intercourse of people belonging to different nations and different traditions. Not only food and clothing but also a host of other necessaries of life are being gathered from all parts of the world. Even the dining table and the drawing-room are becoming international in their nature. If we turn to science, most of the science, e.g., chemistry, physics, mathematics, are all international. The scientific societies of the world have begun to promote free social intercourse between various nations and various countries. So, this measure is in keeping with the general trend of the modern world. Not only that; I think this kind of healthy co-operation and free exchange of ideas will go a great way towards relieving the suffering humanity. I thank the Government for the cordial support they have accorded to the Bill."

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed into law.

V.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920, AND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920 (BILL No. 25 OF 1931.)

Mr. F. BIRLEY:—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move— 1 p

'*that the Bill to amend the District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members:—*

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
Mr. E. Conran Smith.
Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
The Raja of Kallikote.
Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed.
Rao Bahadur T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.

Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
,, F. G. Luker.
,, R. Foulkes.
,, F. Birley (Mover).'

"Mr. President, the purpose of this Bill is perfectly clear. It seeks to limit the amount of the licence fee levied by a district board on a bus to a maximum of Rs. 100. As is well known, at the present time district boards are levying licence fees, which in some cases exceed Rs. 2,000 in the case of a single bus. It is evident that for some time the district boards have looked upon the licence fee as a method of taxation and a source of income in return for the use of the roads. There are differing views as to whether in law a licence fee can be so used and it is interesting to observe that in a recent case arising out of the licence fee levied, on which matter this Bill endeavours to legislate, the views of two distinguished Judges differed.

"This Bill, however, does not base itself upon the legal interpretation of the term 'licence fee'. It bases itself on two points: first, that there should be some uniformity in method and amount in the taxation of this form of transport; secondly, that the intention of the Madras Motor Vehicles Act should be fulfilled. In the Preamble to this Act, it is stated:

'Whereas it is expedient to abolish the levy of taxes on motor vehicles by local bodies within the Presidency and whereas it is also expedient to provide for the levy of a provincial tax on motor vehicles in the Presidency.'

"It was obviously the intention of the framers of this Act that provincial taxation should take the place of local and district taxation. This intention has been fulfilled in the Madras City where there is no district or municipal licence fee. In regard to district board areas it may be necessary, of course, to make alterations in the amount of the provincial tax in order to adjust the revenue derived thereby to the needs of the district, but there is no doubt that the logical sequence to the Act which was placed on the Statute Book in 1931 is that the tax on motor vehicles should be a provincial matter.

"I have pointed out earlier that this Bill seeks to limit the amount of the licence fees levied by a district board in respect of buses to a maximum of Rs. 100 per annum. There are two points in connexion with this maximum figure which I would emphasize. In the first place, the object of fixing a maximum is to allow of variations according to the size of districts and the number of buses plying in those districts. In a district, for example, where there may be only 30 or 40 buses running, the expenses in connexion with issuing licences would be very small, and therefore the amount of the licence fee might be nominal, because no separate staff would be required. On the other hand, in larger districts where the number of buses may run into some hundreds, it is reasonable that the district board should levy a fee which is nearer the maximum allowed by this Bill because a special staff would be necessary. In the second place, I do not tie myself absolutely to the figure of Rs. 100 as the maximum. The actual figure

3rd August 1932] [Mr. F. Birley]

would be a matter for the Select Committee to decide, bearing in mind the general purpose of the Bill to fix an amount suitable to the purpose of a licence fee.

"There is not the slightest doubt that the combination of the provincial tax and the licence fee is steadily breaking up the motor bus traffic and figures will doubtless be given in the course of this discussion to show to what extent buses have been driven off the road. I think the House will agree with me that the opening up of the country which is not touched by the railway through the medium of bus routes is a very important line of development which deserves every encouragement. During the last two years, however, this form of transport has received every conceivable discouragement. In addition to the heavy increase of local taxes, there has also been a heavy increase of duties on the import of buses, petrol, tyres, spare parts, etc. We in this province are not responsible for that increase in the import duties; but we are responsible for seeing that the local taxes borne by this industry in the Presidency are not such as to discourage its development. At the present moment, the industry is taxed by the local bodies to an extent not known in any part of the world, let alone India, and this is partly due to the fact that apart from the Government of India there are in this Presidency at present two different taxing authorities, each concerned to get its maximum out of this unfortunate trade. The proper taxing authority is the Local Government which is concerned to raise money for the roads and which is also concerned vitally in the encouragement of this industry. The proper licensing authority is the district board, which must have control over the buses which ply within its areas. If these principles are understood and appreciated, there can be no doubt that the Select Committee will very soon come to a reasonable agreement as to the actual figure of the maximum licence fee.

"Earlier in my speech I have referred to the intention of the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act. Whatever was the intention of that Bill as originally drafted, the effects of the Act as passed by this House have proved to be little short of calamitous.

"Mr. President, Sir, it was never the intention of the drafters of that Bill to impose an intolerable burden on mechanical transport—there was equally no intention to deprive the district boards and municipalities of the revenue necessary to keep their roads in proper repair. Let us therefore be perfectly frank about the situation. Government is in a quandary; the bus industry is in a mess; the allied trades and industries are wallowing in a slough of despond; the local boards and municipalities are wringing their hands. Are we not, Sir, capable of finding a solution for all these difficulties? I think we are and I think that my Bill is the first step in the right direction—but it is only a step. I trust, therefore, that the House will accept my motion and refer this Bill to the Select Committee which I have mentioned."

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—"I second it."

Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar:—" Sir, I beg to move—

'*that the name of Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan be added to the list of Members of the Select Committee*'."

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—" I second it. "

Mr. F. Birley:—" I accept it. "

The amendment to add the name of Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan was put and carried.

* The hon. the President:—" The question is—

'*that the Bill No. 25 of 1931 be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Members as per list already mixed and which was further amended by Mr. Manikkavelu Nayakar*'."

The motion was carried.

VI.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS IMPARTIBLE ESTATES ACT, 1904.

Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo:—" Mr. President, I beg to move for leave to introduce the Bill to amend the Madras Impartible Estates Act, 1904. "

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" I second it. "

The motion was put and carried.

Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo:—" Sir, I introduce the Bill."

VII.—THE KAPILESWARAPURAM IMPARTIBLE ESTATES BILL.

Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami:—" Mr. President, I move for leave to introduce the Kapileswarapuram Impartible Estates Bill."

Mr. K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu:—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami:—" I introduce the Bill."

VIII.—THE MANGAVARAM, ANAKAPALLE AND NAKKAPALLE IMPARTIBLE ESTATES BILL.

Mr. R. M. Palat:—" Mr. President, I move for leave to introduce the Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Estates Bill."

Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar:—" I second it. "

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. R. M. Palat:—" I introduce the Bill."

IX.—THE MANGAVARAM, ANAKAPALLE AND NAKKAPALLE IMPARTIBLE ESTATES BILL.

The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri:—" Mr. President, I move for leave to introduce the Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill."

Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar:—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri:—" I introduce the Bill. "

X.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920.

S. M. K. BEYABANI SAHIB Bahadur:—" Mr. President, I move for leave to introduce the Bill to amend the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

S. M. K. BEYABANI SAHIB Bahadur:—" I introduce the Bill."

XI.—THE KAPILESWARAPURAM IMPARTIBLE ESTATES BILL.

The ZAMINDAR OF MIRZAPURAM:—" Mr. President, I move for leave to introduce the Kapileswarapuram Impartible Estates Bill."

The ZAMINDAR OF BODINAYAKKANUR:—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

The ZAMINDAR OF MIRZAPURAM:—" I introduce the Bill."

XII.—THE MANGAVARAM, ANAKAPALLE AND NAKKAPALLE IMPARTIBLE ESTATES BILL.

The ZAMINDAR OF KIRLAMPUDI:—" Mr. President, I move for leave to introduce the Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill."

The ZAMINDAR OF MIRZAPURAM:—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

The ZAMINDAR OF KIRLAMPUDI:—" I introduce the Bill."

[Mr. M. Devadasan, who gave notice of a motion to move for leave to introduce the Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Estates Bill, was not in his place when called by the hon. the President.]

XIII.—THE MONEY-LENDERS' BILL.

Mr. C. BASU DEV:—" Mr. President, I move for leave to introduce the Money-lenders' Bill."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU:—" I second it."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" Mr. President, I oppose the motion. We do not know what the principles of the *Bill* for which are asked to give leave for introduction are. Therefore, I should like to have an idea of the subject-matter of the Bill."

* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—" Sir, I least expected to meet with opposition to this Bill especially from my hon. Friend Mr. Arasu at this stage. I have not even got a copy of the Bill with me now as I thought 'leave to introduce' was very formal matter and as the name of the Bill itself was sufficiently indicative of its purpose. This Bill is intended to protect the interests of the large number of debtors from the clutches of money-lenders. Certain classes of money-lenders in this country keep accounts in a language which is little understood by the people. Further the rate of interest charged on the loans given by them ranges from 12 to 75 per cent per annum, and in fact there is no limit to the rate that may be charged by them. A copy of the Bill

[Mr. C. Basu Dev] [3rd August 1932

is just sent to me by the Council office and I had better read the statement of objects and reasons stated therein.

1-15 p.m. "Sir, therefore I shall read it:

'The business of money-lending with which is often associated the sale of jewels and articles of common use as carried on by certain classes of money-lenders is very unsatisfactory and places the debtors who are largely drawn from the middle and working classes at the tender mercy of the money-lenders. The need, ignorance and illiteracy of the debtors are being exploited by certain classes of money-lenders to an unconscionable degree. A certain class or the money-lenders as a rule never give receipts for the moneys they receive from the debtors and they keep their accounts in a language and in a form which none but themselves can decipher or understand. Again the interest charged is exorbitantly high and it is time a reasonable maximum is fixed.

'The aim of this Bill therefore is to fix a reasonable maximum rate of interest, to provide for the good and safe conduct of the business of certain kinds of money-lending and to secure as between certain classes of money-lenders and debtors an improved system of keeping accounts which will give to the latter a means of ascertaining periodically how their accounts stand and how they are composed. At the same time, the Bill is catious enough not to unnecessarily harass the lender and restrict the facilities for credit. Also by excepting certain classes of loans it expressly avoids interference with accounts connected with trade and commerce. The penalties for non-compliance with the provisions of the Bill are not hard but reasonable and just, sufficient to meet the requirements of the case.

'This Bill is practically the Punjab Regulation of Accounts Act of 1930 with a few necessary additions to suit local conditions.'

"I think that this House will now give me permission to introduce the Bill."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. C. Basu Dev:—"I introduce the Bill."

XIV.—THE MANGAVARAM, ANAKAPALLE AND NAKKAPALLE *IMPARTIBLE ESTATES BILL.*

Mr. K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu:—"I move for leave to introduce the Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill."

Mr. V. G. Vasudeva Pillai:—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu:—"I introduce the Bill."

XV.—THE MANGAVARAM, ANAKAPALLE AND NAKKAPALLE IMPARTIBLE ESTATES BILL.

Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar:—"I move for leave to introduce the Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill."

The motion was duly seconded and put and carried.

Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar:—"I introduce the Bill."

[Mr. V. T. Arasu, who gave notice to move for leave to introduce the Artisans' Bill, was not in his place when called by the hon. the President.]

XVI.—THE ARTISANS' BILL.

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"I move for leave to introduce the Artisans' Bill."

3rd August 1932]

The motion was duly seconded and put and carried.

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar :—" I introduce the Bill."

XVII.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920.

Mr. P. C. Moses :—" I move for leave to introduce the Bill to amend the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920."

Mr. M. S. Sreshta :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. P. C. Moses :—" I introduce the Bill."

[Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti, who gave notice to move for leave to introduce the Artisans' Bill, was not in his place when called by the hon. the President.

Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj, who gave notice to move for leave to introduce the Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill, was not in his place when called by the hon. the President.]

XVIII.—THE MANGAVARAM, ANAKAPALLE AND NAKKAPALLE IMPARTIBLE ESTATES BILL.

Mr. P. Madhusoodhanan Thangal :—" I move for leave to introduce the Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill."

The motion was duly seconded, put and carried.

Mr. P. Madhusoodhanan Thangal :—" I introduce it."

XIX.—THE ARTISANS' BILL.

Mr. H. M. Jagannatham :—" I move for leave to introduce the Artisans' Bill."

Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. H. M. Jagannatham :—" I introduce the Bill."

XX.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920.

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar :—" I move for leave to introduce the Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920."

Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar :—" I introduce the Bill."

XXI.—THE ARTISANS' BILL.

Pandit Ganala Ramamurti :—" I move for leave to introduce the Artisans' Bill."

Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Pandit Ganala Ramamurti :—" I introduce the Bill."

[The Raja of Bobbili, who gave notice to introduce a Bill further to amend the *Madras Impartible Estates Act, 1904 (Bill No. 8 of* 1932), was not in his place when called by the hon. the President.]

XXII.—RESOLUTION ON MATTERS OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

SERVICE OF COPYISTS AND COPYIST-EXAMINERS IN THE REVENUE COURTS.

Discussion on the following resolution of Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan was resumed:—

'*This Council recommends to the Government that the service of copyists and copyist-examiners in the Revenue courts of this Presidency be made permanent and pensionable.*'

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member who moved the resolution has spoken on it, and it has been seconded by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, if I remember right. So the discussion on this resolution will continue."

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"Mr. President, Sir, I am afraid it is not possible for Government to accept this resolution at the present time for these reasons. At present the copyists are paid on the basis of actual work turned out by them. Sometimes, there is a good deal of work to be done in particular offices, and the extra copyists are employed for the purpose and paid under the rules applying to copyists and copyist-examiners. If we make this staff permanent, we should have to pay them whether they have work or not. In that way there will be considerable waste of money. In the second place, in these times of financial stringency it will not be possible to adopt any such measure as it will involve a considerable increase in expenditure. We have to keep down our expenditure as low as possible and we cannot undertake to introduce measures which will increase the expenditure on any particular service."

Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur:—"These copyists have got very hard work to do and it will not cost Government very much to put them on a permanent basis. In answer to a question of mine some time ago, a statement of income and expenditure of the copyists for the last ten years was placed before this House by the hon. the Revenue Member. That showed that the income was far in excess of the expenditure in connexion with the pay of the copyists. So, if something more is given or if the pay is made permanent, there would not be any loss to Government. So, I heartily support this motion."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"I am sorry that the hon. the Revenue Member is not agreeable to this motion, but if he would examine this question he will find that it will not cost the Government anything more financially. The copyists are at present paid on the piece work they do, but if they are made permanent, the Government will find it advantageous to them and at the same time it will not cost them more than what they pay now for piece work. I can even go to the extent of saying that, if the Government agree to this resolution and make these people permanent, it will not cause any loss to them, but it will prove to be a source of profit to them."

3rd August 1932]

Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur:—" Mr. President, Sir, from the point of view of economy also, it is better that these copyists are given fixed salaries. From information furnished by the persons concerned, I came to the conclusion that ordinarily the copyists are paid more than what an ordinary clerk gets. Sometimes, when the work is in full swing, they get more than Rs. 50 a month. But their complaint is that on days on which they could not work it is not possible for them to get these wages. In that way they are handicapped. Moreover, from the figures supplied to me, it is very clear that, while a clerk in the same department earns Rs. 35 a month, a copyist gets sometimes Rs. 50 to Rs. 60. The tendency on the part of persons who are not earning more money is to bring in more men in competition and thus try to bring down their emoluments. So, in Revenue courts and Civil courts, the number of these copyists has increased, and their average emoluments also reduced on account of other men being brought in to do the same copying work. Moreover he is the servant of the public and of the Government. He serves in the 1-30 p.m
department for the whole of his life, say, for about 30 or 35 years. Naturally he expects a pension. No pension or provident fund is allowed to him. He practically goes without a pension or provident fund after serving the Government and the public for 30 or 35 years. So, I have great pleasure in supporting the motion of my hon. Friend, Mr. Hameed Khan, and trust that the Government will see their way to place the copyists and copyist-examiners on a par with other clerks."

* The hon. the President:—" The discussion on this motion may continue later.

" Before we adjourn I wish to inform the House that amendments in connexion with the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill will be received until 1-45 p.m., to facilitate the circulation of amendments to all other Members of the House before we meet again after lunch."

The House then adjourned for lunch.

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.)

III.—THE TIRUMALAI-TIRUPATI DEVASTHANAMS BILL—*cont.*

* The hon. the President:—" Bill No. 15, as amended by the Select Committee, is now for the consideration of the House. I shall now put each clause to the vote of the House."

Clauses 1 to 5 were put and carried.

Clause 6 (1).

* Mr. K. Koti Reddi:—" Mr. President, I move that—

> '*in line* 2, *for the words " of whom four " the word " who " be substituted and all the words after the word " determine " in line* 8 *be omitted.*'

" With your permission, Sir, I shall move the other amendment proposing the persent Mahant as an additional Member, afterwards.

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi] [3rd August 1932

"Sir, my object in moving this amendment is this: the section as it stands provides for both nomination as well as election of Members of the Committee. I provide by my amendment that the Members of the Committee should be entirely elected and that no choice be given to the Government to nominate Members to the Committee. I take it, Sir, that the Government either believes in the capacity of the Members of this House to elect proper persons or not. If the Government believe that this Legislative Council is capable enough, and is sufficiently educated to select Members to this Committee, I fail to see why they (the Government) should be given power to nominate two Members to the Committee. The Committee is a very small Committee consisting of seven Members. I believe that this Council will consist of more Members in the future constitution and as such I fail to see why this House should not be entrusted with the power of electing all the Members. There will always be a majority for the Government in the Council. If the Government are in a position to carry through their business by means of their voting strength, they can always see that a majority of Members amenable to their influences and agreeable to their wishes are selected as Members of this Committee. It is only just and fair that a Committee of this sort which is a responsible body entrusted with the management of a big temple whose income is somewhere about 16 lakhs of rupees should consist of Members entirely elected by this Council.

"With regard to the present Mahant, my next amendment also makes provision to give him a chance. There are some Members of this House who have a very tender heart for him on account of his business capacity and also because he has rendered long service as the Vicharanakartha of the temple. Provision can be made to give the present Mahant a chance to serve on the Committee by making him an additional Member in addition to the seven Members. Whether the present Mahant will be a Member or not, the purpose of my amendment is to see that all the seven Members of the Committee should be elected by the Council. With these few words I move my amendment of which I have given notice."

Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder:—"I beg to second the amendment."

* The hon. the President:—"Mr. Koti Reddi's amendment is for the discussion of the House. It runs thus:—

'*That in line 2 of section* 6 (1) *for the words "of whom four," the word "who" shall be substituted.*

'*That all the words in line 8 after the word "determine" be omitted*'."

* Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—"I am sorry that this amendment cannot be accepted by me for this reason, that if the Mahant is made an additional Member it will increase the strength of the Committee and it will be an even number of 8. It will be a difficult matter if the Members are divided equally as four

3rd August 1932] [Mr. C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar]

and four in which case, the President will have to be giving his casting vote. As the section stands at present, the Mahant will be one among seven Members. Leaving the Mahant, there will be two Members to be nominated by the Government. This question was discussed at great length in the Select Committee and they finally came to the conclusion that two of the Members at least should be nominated by the Government. It may not be quite possible for representatives of all sections of the Hindu community to be on the Committee. Sir, only those who possesses the party strength may be selected for the Committee and it may not always be possible that the Committee would be of a representative character. My hon. Friend Dr. Subbarayan wanted that at least one member of the depressed classes should be nominated as a Member of the Committee. So in order to provide for the representation of this community and other such communities it is necessary that Government should take power to nominate at least two Members to the Committee."

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—" Sir, this amendment will lose all its importance if the Government becomes autonomous, because in that case there will be no difference between the Government and the Legislatnre as the hon. Ministers will then be really responsible to the Legislature. Therefore it really does not matter whether this amendment is carried or not. Under diarchy such a provision is necessary and people who want to amend the present section do believe that this Legislature is diarchical and may not take into consideration the interests of minorities. So far as the future Government is concerned, it is not going to be diarchical, and therefore my hon. Friend Mr. Koti Reddi may not press his amendment."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—" Sir, I beg to move—

> 'Instead *of the word* " *four* " *in section* 6 (1) substitute *the word* " *five* " *and* for *the word* " *three* " substitute *the word* " *two* ".'

" If there is going to be election and also nomination, it is not proper that there should be four elected seats and three nominated seats. If there is going to be election, there should be a large number of seats. Nomination should be resorted to only as a last resort if we find that elected Members do not do full justice to the cause of the minority communities. But if the nominated seats are going to be as many as three what is the point in having an elected Committee? Therefore, I wish to move that the word 'four' be substituted by the word 'five.' There may be five seats for the elected Hindu Members and three seats for nomination by the Government."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Sir, this is only a very small amendment and I do not think the hon. Member in charge of the Bill need raise any objection to it. The elected element is increased by only one and the nominated element is decreased correspondingly. 2-4 p.m

All the same the interests of unrepresented communities will best be served and incidentally the hon. the Minister will not be bothered with applications for seats on the Committee. Provision is made in the Bill for election by the Legislative Council of either Members of the Council or outsiders. Therefore the Council should be empowered to elect as many Members as posible so that they may elect a few from among themselves and a few from outside. The greater the number of Members to be elected by the Council the greater will be the chances of outsiders being elected by the Council. In the interests of those who are not Members of the Council, the amendment to substitute in sub-section (1) the word 'five' for the word 'four' and the word 'two' for the word 'three' is necessary. I therefore support the amendment."

* *Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar* :—" Sir, the object of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti can be better attained if the Government had the power of nominating at least two Members. The Government may nominate either Members of this Council or outsiders. Once the principle of nomination by Government is accepted it is better that they have the power of nominating at least two Members."

* Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar :—" Sir, I quite appreciate the intention of the hon. Member from Madras to give greater chances to outsiders being elected by the Legislative Council. But unless some seats are reserved for outsiders as such, human nature being what it is, the Council will certainly try to satisfy its own Members by electing them, rather than outsiders. I am practically certain that only Members of the Council will get elected. Therefore, while appreciating the position taken up by Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti in this matter, I think, in order to secure the very object for which he pleaded, it is much better that power is vested in the Government to nominate two Members of the Committee. Because it is only then, taking into consideration the fact that all the Members of the Committee are Members of the Council that the Government will have a chance to appoint outsiders to the Committee."

Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar :—" Sir, from the remarks made by the hon. Member for North Arcot, I am surprised to see that he places more faith in the executive than in the legislature of which he is a Member. The Council is certainly the best body to elect representatives, it itself being a representative body elected by the whole Presidency. It is only in the fitness of things that this Council should elect four or five Members to sit on the Committee entrusted with the task of administering these endowments. If the Legislative Council cannot trust itself, I do not think we need sit here and discuss things at all. Why should the hon. Member fear that we will not be electing outsiders at all? Suppose five Members have to be elected. Even putting it at the worst, if three are elected from the Council, two at least will be elected from outside. I do not see what useful purpose will be served if we deny ourselves the power of electing the Committee and put it in the hands of the Government. I am particularly sorry

3rd August 1932]

that the hon. Member who represents Labour should take up an attitude like this on a question concerning a democratic institution."

The amendment was put and lost.

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—" Sir, I move—

'*that the word " Hindu " occurring before the words " Members of the Legislative Council " be deleted.*'

" I think, Sir, that the principle enunciated in this clause is unique and undesirable. I am not aware of any other Committee elected by this Council where its members whatever their denominations and the religious principles they subscribe to, are denied the right of voting. I can understand the principle being enunciated that the members elected should be Hindus, but members of other denominations who have got seats in this Council, why they should be denied the right to elect members to this Committee, I for one do not understand. It is a very unfair provision. We who do not subscribe to the Hindu system of belief hold no partisan views and if anything at all, we will take a detached view of things not being interested in this or that party. (Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti: 'That is your disqualification.') That is exactly our qualification, because Hindu Members may, under certain circumstances, take a partisan view. I think that this obnoxious and invidious distinction that is proposed to be set up by this clause should be removed. I therefore move that the word ' Hindu ' be deleted and the usual procedure adopted in the matter of elections is adopted in this case also. It is stated here that the election should be by the method of proportional representation. We elect many committees here by the method of proportional representation. I am not aware of any case where the Council as a whole does not take part in such elections."

Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar:—" I second the amendment."

* Mr. F. E. James:—" Sir, it is difficult for one like myself to speak on a matter like this. But I should like as an individual member of this House to express my agreement with the idea underlying this amendment. I can understand a provision which said that the committee shall consist of members of whom so many shall be Hindus and shall be elected from among members of the council by the members of the council. But this principle of introducing separate electorates in this Council, I am surprised to see emanating from the hon. Member for Coimbatore. I very much doubt whether it is wise to adopt it. I may draw a rough analogy with what happened in the House of Commons on two occasions. First of all it will be remembered that when the discussion on the English prayer book took place in the House of Commons, it was suggested that members of the House of Commons who were not members of the Church of England should not take part in voting on that particular question. That suggestion was very warmly resented by the other members of the House on the ground that no one has any right to deprive an individual member of a legislature of his

right of voting on matters that come before the House. Another analogy—again it is a rough one—is in regard to matters pertaining to the Church of England which are dealt with by a body known as the Church Assembly. I can understand the administration of temples, in detail at any rate, being taken out of the hands of the Legislative Council and being delegated, if you like, to a separate Hindu assembly which would be a subordinate legislative body of this Council. That is the principle which has been accepted in England with regard to the administration of the Church of England. But even in regard to that matter the House of Commons remains the sovereign legislative body on matters of general principle and the individual members of the House of Commons whether they be Atheists, Jews, Protestants, Roman Catholics or members of the Church of England, have the right of voting on matters which come before that assembly. Therefore, when I first saw this Bill a few weeks ago it did occur to me as to whether it would be wise to restrict the right of voting to one particular section of the House. I do not say we should follow slavishly the precedents of other assemblies, but I do suggest that this may give rise to further divisions in regard to matters that come before the House. For instance, when the question of wakfs comes before the House, it naturally occurs to one that the Muhammadan members of the House may wish to be separated from the rest in voting on that question. The matter might go to the extent of dividing the privileges of the House among the members of the different communities. I have taken part in this discussion with very great respect to the members of the House who are dealing with this matter. But I do venture to express, if I may, a mild doubt as to the wisdom of putting this particular disqualification upon the non-Hindu members of the Council, because, I fear that such a precedent if accepted might lead the House later on in other matters to follow the same example."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Sir, I am afraid my hon. and esteemed Friend, Diwan Bahadur Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, has introduced, perhaps quite unintentionally, a very serious controversy in this matter. Sir, it seems we cannot rise above thinking politically always. If we have certain ideas with regard to the politics of this country, it looks as though we have got to introduce those ideas in all our aspects of life. That is rather a very narrow view of life. Life
3 p.m. has got many more functions in this world than mere hankering after democratic representation and allied things. It is this confused thinking, this confused introduction of politics into every aspect of life that makes the conservative people object to interference with religion, religious institutions and religious customs. I dare say that most of the hon. Members are aware of the strong opposition which this Council encountered when the Hindu Religious Endowments Act was in the process of being made into law. One of the grounds of objection—and that was a very serious objection—to the passing of that measure was that once it was conceded that these temples and religious institutions could be interfered with by the Government, nobody could know or

3rd August 1932] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti]

define to what extent that interference would extend. But a more enlightened opinion prevailed that the Government knew the limits of interference and that they would not go more than it is quite necessary and that the sanctity and integrity of these institutions would be kept up without importing secular and other material considerations in the administration of those institutions. That point being conceded, the Hindu Religious Endowments Act is being worked. Here and there there are protests made against interference with particular customs and usages. Particularly in Trichinopoly and Srirangam we are hearing of instances of the Board trying to introduce its own views with regard to the actual customs and rituals which are prevalent in those temples. But those objections have not yet taken any serious shape for us to bring to the notice of the Government that the Board is exceeding its powers. But that is a sufficient warning for the Government to know where they should stop and where the question of democratic representation ought to be limited. One of the reasons urged by my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, for omitting the word 'Hindu' and for making the electorate consist of people of all religions and castes is that they are better qualified to exercise the vote inasmuch as they are quite disinterested and that they are not likely to take a partisan view of things. But in the matter of representation, it is an axiomatic truth that it is only those who are interested in particular institutions that should vote. It is only such people whose interests are affected, it is only such people whose privileges have to be safeguarded, it is only such people who feel that these institutions are theirs, that should have a final say in a matter governing those bodies. The question of joint electorate, of communal electorate or special electorate does not come in. People who strongly believe that joint electorates are good for the country, can certainly take the other view that so far as religious and communal institutions are concerned, they should be masters of their own household. Simply because we have been advocating joint electorates with regard to certain representative institutions, it does not follow that the same principle should be followed in the regulation of family affairs. Simply because we have conceded that joint election is good for the country, it does not mean that we should allow our family affairs to be regulated by people not belonging to the family. That will be carrying the analogy too far and it would make the whole position too absurd.

"My hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, said that he had not come across instances where certain sections of the House were denied the right of voting. I am afraid he has forgotten many such instances in this Council. In the first place, for the election of non-official Members of this Council for the Finance Committee, the official block is excluded from exercising its vote. That is so, because it is recognized that those people whose right has to be safeguarded and whose interests are to be represented in a particular body, should not be interfered with by any other group or block which has no such interest. Again, for the election of Members to the Senate of the Andhra University, it is not only officials that are excluded from voting but also all

[Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti] [3rd August 1932

those who do not happen to reside in the districts comprising the Andhra University area are not entitled to vote. It is quite reasonable and quite consistent with the existing practice with regard to institutions to which representatives are elected by this Council. I only beg that those hon. Members who are under the mistaken impression that their views with regard to joint electorates and special electorates might come into conflict with the view that they should vote for the retention of the word ' Hindu,' would view the matter in quite a different light. They should consider whether they would permit other people to interfere in these elections. I do not think the Muslims are going to allow Hindu Members to vote when any question affecting their institutions exclusively, comes before the Council. Having regard to their own interests, having regard to the prospect of the same thing being repeated when their properties and religious institutions come for legislation, it is desirable that the Muslims should, even now, not interfere with the electorates intended for Hindu religious institutions. I beg my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, not to press his amendment; he may be academically speaking on mere principles and everybody would like to take part in the discussion. With regard to those institutions, people are guided more by faith than by other considerations. The introduction of this provision will be very mischievous."

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—" Sir, I am very much in sympathy with the earnest desire of the hon. Member who wishes to see that no distinction should be made among the Members of this Legislature. Indeed he has rightly brought to the notice of the House that it should not make any such distinction. I am a cosmopolitan; I am, therefore, entirely in sympathy with his views. If it is possible for Hindus to be elected to Committees or Councils of Christian Churches, we will not have any grievance at all. These religious denominations have particular functions to perform; they have definite duties. Hindu customs and Hindu worship have definite forms and methods. It is not a purely political matter that we are considering now. . . "

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I correct my hon. Friend? He is mixing up matters. His objections will be quite all right if I asked for the omission of the word ' Hindu ' in clause 7. We are considering clause 6."

Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—" I am speaking of the electorate. We understand him much better than himself. He does not know where he is, because he is very vague. We are quite definite in our position; we say that in accordance with precedents only the Hindu electorate of this House should take part in those elections.

" Then my hon. Friend representing the Planters referred to the analogy in the House of Commons. I find he is not in his seat now. I hope he has studied the composition of this House and that of the House of Commons. The House of Commons is composed of Christians only. But here this House does not consist of Hindus only but of people of various religions. Therefore the analogy to which the hon. Member referred, does not hold water; his other remarks are not quite

3rd August 1932] [Sir A. P. Patro]

relevant to the case. You will find in clause 17 that the functions of this Committee are defined; one of the functions is to arrange for the conduct of the daily worship and ceremonies and of the festivals in every temple according to its usage. The functions of the Committee are not only to manage the properties and affairs of the devasthanams but also to arrange for the conduct of the worship, ceremonies and festivals. No Christian or Mussalman Member can possibly be an elector to a Committee which has to supervise the festivals and ceremonies relating to the temples. Therefore, the provision rightly says that only Hindu Members who are concerned with these temples, should elect Members to the Committee. No more argument is necessary, because the position is very plain."

* Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo:—" Sir, I want to make a few remarks on this point. If you will just recall the circumstances under which the management of this temple was transferred to the Mahant, you will find that it is not on account of the narrowness of the Hindu religion that this temple was transferred but because of the pressure of the Christian missionaries. At that time, Christian missionaries supposed that those who were administering the country on behalf of the East India Company were subscribing to idolatry if they were managing or supervising these temples. Those Christian missionaries thus showed their narrow-mindedness. It was only on that account that the management was transferred to the Mahant. If Government had not withdrawn from the management of the temple then, the management would not have changed now. In that case, there would have been no difficulty at all. Previously, I believe the Nawabs of the Carnatic were supervising the management of these temples. If that is so, there is absolutely no reason why Muhammadans or Christians should not take part in the election of only Hindu Members. I do not see why any Hindu should object to it. Anybody who would object to this proposition would not be considered to be liberal or large-hearted. I think Hindu religion is very liberal. It was only on account of the narrow views of the Christian missionaries that Government withdrew from the management. If Christians or Muhammadans show themselves large-hearted now, let them take part in the election to this Committee. Of course, you have given power to the Government to nominate certain Members to this Committee. Supposing my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, becomes a Minister and is in charge of these religious endowments, or supposing that all the three Ministers are Christians, they may nominate members. Therefore, how can anyone object to Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar taking part in the election?

" Now look at the question from another stand point. All matters connected with temples go to Courts. For instance, questions regarding election of members may go to courts. Do you always see Hindus there as freely as you see many Muhammadan and Christian Judges in the District Courts and the High Court? Did not this very institution go up to the District Court, the High Court and to the Privy 3-15 p.m.

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo] [3rd August 1932

Council? Are all those Judges there Hindus? You subjected this institution to the decisions of those Christian Judges; I do not see how you can object to this amendment now. The Muhammadan and Christian Members of this Council have simply to say whether particular persons should be elected or not. They simply take part in the election. *Of course, these Christian and Muhammadan Members won't go* into the temple. For the matter of that, suppose all these seven persons happen to be non-Brahmans. These people would not be allowed to go into the inner temple in order to supervise the worship there; that will be considered objectionable. Or you may have representatives of the depressed classes. Would you allow any of these people to go into the inner temple? I fear that cannot be done. If that is so, there is absolutely no reason why Muhammadans and Christians should not take part, if they wish to, contrary to what their ancestors did previously; I think Hindus should welcome such an attitude on their part and not show themselves as illiberal."

* Mr. K. P. Raman Menon :—" Mr. President, the point has been very much obscured by dragging in the ancient history of the institution and also the point as to what the Hindus expect the Muhammadans to do and other things. If one looks into the provisions of this clause, one can see more or less that only the Hindus can partake in the election of the Members of the Committee. First of all, what was thought necessary was to have an elected Committee. We started with that—whether it was to be seven or eight or four members, we wanted an elected Committee. Then the question arose: who was to be elected to that Committee? It was mentioned that the Committee should consist of persons professing the Hindu faith. Then the question was: who were the persons to elect members to that Committee? Naturally, it was the whole Hindu electorate, comprising the Hindu residents of the province. But we have not got the necessary machinery to bring them together and to make them elect the particular persons who are to form the members of the Committee. On the other hand, we have their representatives in the Legislative Council, the Hindu elected Members of the Legislative Council. So, probably, the framers of this section hit upon the idea of falling back upon the Hindu Members of this Legislative Council who are elected by the Hindu electorate of this province, to form the electorate for the election of the members of the Committee. This evidently is the genesis of the section and there is absolutely nothing therein to suggest that the Christians and Mussalmans will not have the mental equilibrium to choose the right person for the right office, and so on. We need not introduce all those complications here. If we only analyse the section, if we see what is the basic idea contained in the section, we can easily find that it is to have Hindu Committee Members elected by the Hindu public of the entire Presidency. In the absence of such an electorate, there are the Hindu Members of this Legislative Council which body forms a good electorate. That is the whole point, and there is no necessity to confuse that with the other larger questions as to whether persons who

3rd August 1932] [Mr. K. P. Raman Menon]

want joint electorates can come into this electorate, whether we should not allow Muhammadans and Christians to associate with us in this respect especially when the Nawabs of the Carnatic and the East India Company were administering Hindu temples, and so on. All these questions are not quite relevant. I submit it on these lines the origin of the section is thought out, there will be no difficulty in inducing Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar to withdraw his amendment."

* Mr. V. T. Arasu:—"Sir, I rise to give support to the amendment moved by the hon. the Floor Leader of the Opposition. I am surprised at the attitude taken up by the hon. Member from Ganjam, Sir Patro, and the hon. Member from Madras, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. Firstly, Sir Patro was confusing and confounding the issue when he said that non-Hindu Members should not be given any hand in the management of the temple. If you will carefully read the amendment of Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, you can find that the amendment relates only to the electorate and not to the Members of the Committee. All that the amendment seeks to do is that the Legislative Council, as a body, should be empowered to elect four Hindu Members to serve on the Committee of this devasthanam. What objection can there be to this proposal? And I contend that there can be no objection to non-Hindu Members being included in the electorate. In this, I am supported by precedents. If Sir Patro would only refresh his memory, he would remember that during the time when he was himself a Member of the Madras Cabinet—I believe it was in the year 1923—the Hindu Religious Endowments Act was passed. If you analyse the division list by means of which that Act was passed into law, you will find that quite a large number of the Mussalman and Christian Members of this House participated in the division, and that but for their votes, the Hindu Religious Endowments Bill which was introduced by the Raja of Panagal would not be on the Statute Book to-day. Sir, when you seek the help of the Christian and Mussalman Members of this Council to pass an important law concerning Hindu religious institutions, and when with their votes you manage to pass it into an Act, what objection is there to allow Christian and Mussalman Members of this House to participate in the election of a Committee? The bogey of religion in danger now comes in.

"Then the hon. Member from Madras said that we must not import political ideas into this matter which is essentially religious. Yes, I am in agreement with the hon. Member. But, Sir, I can understand if this power of constituting a Committee is vested in the hands of a religious body—say some Sabha of Ayyangar Brahmans of Tirupathi. On the other hand, the power of constituting this Committee is vested in a non-religious body, and a body which is pre-eminently political, the Legislative Council. Therefore, I ask the hon. Member from Madras, whether he is prepared to introduce separate electorates in a political institution. This is not a religious institution. In a

political institution like this, he advocates the introduction of communal electorates by which he would exclude Christian and Mussalman Members from participating in the election of members to the Committee of the Tirupati temple.

"Lastly, Sir, one thing which I should like to bring to the notice of this House is this: that is, the analogy of the House of Lords in the English Parliament. Hon. Members of this House know that the House of Lords in England constitutes the supreme appellate authority. Though it consists of all sorts of people not well-versed in law, still it constitutes the supreme appellate authority in the Realm. When appeals come before the House of Lords, the lay Lords as they are called, simply clear out of the House and leave the Law Lords alone to come to a decision on such matters. In the same manner, I think when it comes to a question of actual election of members to this Committee, the non-Hindu Members of this House will have the good sense to abstain from voting. That is quite possible. But I am opposed to the idea of statutorily invalidating them from taking part in the election. For these reasons I appeal to this House to accept the amendment of the hon. Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar."

* Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I am indeed sorry that this amendment should have been moved. I fear there is a lot of confusion with reference to the object of what is proposed to legislate here. We are not here giving power to the Legislative Council as such to nominate members. That seems to be the idea with which the present amendment is moved. If, for instance, the power of management of this particular temple is vested in the Legislative Council and it is to appoint some deputies to manage the temple on behalf of the Legislative Council, I think then the amendment would be the proper thing to be moved here, and certainly nobody who objects to that will be in the right. But what is proposed here is not the giving of any power of nomination to the Legislative Council as such, but the formation of a convenient electorate for electing persons to manage this institution. Various proposals were made before the Select Committee in this regard; one was to give seats to the different districts, so that Members might be elected in the same way as members of temple committees are elected—i.e., by the same electorate. Another proposal was that the districts around Tirupati should be given the same power, and it was felt that as the temple is a very important temple in southern India, those who elect persons to this Committee should be persons belonging not only to one district, but to several districts. In regard to this, it was thought that it would not be possible to arrange for an electorate sufficiently wide for electing members to this Committee. It was therefore felt that that power might be given to the Hindu Members of the Legislative Council, not as Members of the Legislative Council, but as persons chosen by the larger Hindu electorate. That was the idea. Simply because we could not find any other arrangement by which to bring together a sufficiently

3rd August 1932] [Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar]

large number of electors to elect members to this committee, we hit upon this idea of having people who are already elected by the several districts, as the electors in a sort of secondary election. That was the idea with which this proposal was made—not that any special powers were sought to be given to the Legislative Council as such. I, therefore, beg to submit that the amendment now moved does not take into consideration that governing idea with which the provision was made in the Bill.

"Then, Sir, it is also forgotten that we are not here legislating for ourselves. Sir, religion is a very delicate matter; and so far as the ordinary people are concerned, they feel very strongly in such matters. I put it to my hon. Friends of the Muhammadan religion and even of the Christian religion—which is supposed to be more advanced—whether they would tolerate or will be prepared to allow the managers of their mosques or their churches to be elected by Hindus. I am yet to know of a Christian institution in which the Church Council is elected by members of the Hindu community. (Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—But this is a Legislative Council!) True. To say, Sir, that the members of the committee of management of a Hindu temple should be elected by persons who do not belong to the Hindu religion is a thing which would not be liked not only by the Hindus but by the Muhammadans and the Christians as well who feel deeply on religious matters; it is not a thing which they will endorse. So, it seems to me that this particular amendment has been based on a false conception of the idea with which the provision has been introduced in this clause. I hope, Sir, my hon. Friend will not press it."

* Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—"Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of this House is aware that it is only in recent years that measures of this kind are moved in the Legislative Councils of the country. Some years ago, when measures of this kind were brought forward either by the Government or by private Members of the Council, every one said that religion was in danger. In recent years, Government have taken the right view to bring forward measures to improve institutions and private members also have taken advantage of it. In matters of this kind, one has to go very cautiously. We have to take not only the feeling of this House, but that of the Hindu public outside also. I am, like my hon. Friend, Sir Patro, in full sympathy with the objects of the amendment moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. But I am here as representing the general Hindu public and I must voice forth what the feelings of that community will be if non-Hindu Members of the Legislative Council are allowed to take part in the matter of election of members to the committee. All the hon. Members of this House have been taking part in the discussion on the Bill—every Member of a legislative body has a statutory right to take part in the discussion—in shaping this Bill and bringing it into an Act. After that has been done, I am afraid, in working out the Act, and in giving effect to the Act, the non-Hindu Members who have nothing to do with any institution for which a committee is to be formed, if they are allowed to

3-30 p.m.

[Mr. C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar] [3rd August 1932

take part, there will be considerable resentment among the general Hindu public. It is their feeling that we have to take into account in matters of this kind. In another five or ten years, it is quite possible that the feeling of the general public may change, but we have to look at it from the point of view of as to how it would be taken by them at present. When that is considered, I am afraid the feeling will be in favour of the clause as it stands and it will surely be against the amendment proposed by my hon. Friend Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.

"Sir, I am surprised at the attitude taken by Mr. V. T. Arasu. If to-day a referendum is issued I am sure that 99 per cent of the Hindu voters of the city will say that the non-Hindu Members of the Legislative Council should not be given the right to take part in the election of members to the committee. So, Sir, I oppose the amendment."

* Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I *rise to support the amendment of my hon. Friend Mr. Arogyaswami* Mudaliyar. There are many reasons why I should support the amendment. When the Hindu Religious Endowments Act was brought into force, a member of my community sat on the Select Committee and they made certain rules whereby the district boards and municipalities could return Hindu members to the temple committees from among themselves. But if any member were to take a census and find out whether any depressed class member, who is also a Hindu, was ever returned to any of the temple committees, the answer will be 'No'. It was Dr. Subbarayan who was bold enough to nominate some of the members of the depressed classes to the various temple committees, when he was in office. Now, due to some law, even that nomination has been stopped. After all, the amendment seeks to give power to Members of the Legislative Council to choose Hindu members for a committee that is going to manage the affairs of the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams. That being the case, I do not see any reason why all the Members of the Legislative Council should not be given a chance to take part in the election. If this amendment is allowed, I think, Sir, the depressed classes also will find a place in those committees. Now, under the garb of custom, though we are Hindus—taking my own case, I am a Vaishnavite—if we like to go to Tirupati to worship the deity, there is no chance? I do not blame the Hindu Members of the Legislative Council; I have a great regard for them and I hope they will have a better chance of going to those committees."

Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur:—Mr. President, Sir, I am surprised to see members of very advanced views like my hon. Friend Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti coming forward to oppose this very reasonable amendment. My hon. Friend Mr. Sami Venkatachalam complained of confusion of ideas on the part of the hon. Mover of the amendment, but I think he himself has confounded it still further and made it worse still. First of all the word 'Hindu' is not defined. I wish to know whether some of us who are Brahmos including Sir A. P. Patro, are Hindus. (Loud laughter from the opposition.) That is

indeed very vague. The comparison made by Sir A. P. Patro about the English Parliament is not quite correct. He said that the Parliament consists only of Christians but he is quite mistaken. As a matter of fact, there are several Jews, and even Parsees and Muhammadans are also there. If the minority communities do ask for separate electorates, it is only because the election outside is done by illiterate masses, who cannot distinguish things properly. But, here the election is to be made by enlightened representatives of the people who compose this House. Now, hon. Members here trying to introduce communal electorates in this Council also is really surprising. If the Hindus want separate electorate for electing members to a committee which is to deal with matters concerning Hindus, the Christians may also require another Christian electorate; so also the Muslims and Adi-Dravidas. And we Brahmos also may require our own electorate and so there will be no end to all this confusion worst confounded. I therefore hope that my hon. Friend Mr. Sami Venkatachalam and others will not oppose, but will kindly support the very reasonable amendment moved by Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar."

* Rao Bahadur A. T. PANNIRSELVAM:—Mr. President, Sir, as one who believes in separate electorates as the most efficient means of securing true and correct representation, I feel that I should oppose the amendment moved by the hon. Diwan Bahadur Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. The institution that has to be administered by this committee being Hindu it is but right and proper that it should be managed by persons who are truly and wholly Hindus and who represent the Hindus alone and it is therefore in the fitness of things that the electorate that is to return members to the committee should be exclusively Hindu. The Tirumalai Devasthanam is a Hindu pie and why should Christians or the Muslims want to dip their fingers in it. It is the affair of the Hindus and they have to manage things for themselves.

"Again, Sir, I find from the report of the Select Committee that the annual revenue of the devasthanam is somewhere about 16 lakhs of rupees and may I ask, Sir, if there is one Christian or one Muslim in this House or even outside who contributes a single pie towards the devasthanam funds. It is their money contributed exclusively by the Hindus. Why then should the Christians or the Mussalmans be anxious to have a voice in the management of that devasthanam. I do feel strongly, that being a Hindu institution, it should be wholly and exclusively Hindu. In this connexion my hon. Friend Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar from Coimbatore put a very pertinent question. He asked us if there can be a single Muslim or for that matter a single Christian who would agree to the Hindus forming part of the electorate to any Council that might be formed to administer a Christian charity or a Muslim charity. As a Catholic myself, I hope that there would be no occasion for any State interference with the affairs of my church but if there should be any occasion for such interference at all, I should certainly not desire that the Hindus, the Muslims or even the

[Mr. A. T. Pannirselvam] [3rd August 1932

Protestant community, should have anything to do with it. That is a matter concerning myself and the people of my faith alone should have a voice in it. Therefore, it is but right and proper that the Hindus should claim and form their own electorate in this matter.

"It may perhaps be thought unfortunate that the Christian representative of the City should have raised this debate. But, at the same time, I believe it has had its purpose in this way. It should have given him an insight into the mentality of his Hindu colleagues on the other side of the House. I could understand my hon. Friend and Leader, Sir Patro assuming the attitude he did, belonging as he does to a party which believes in each section of the community being given the right to manage its affairs in its own way and he has been perfectly consistent. However agreeing as I do with my hon. Friend from the City, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, I cannot help expressing my surprise at the attitude he has adopted. That at least shows the way in which his mind works. If it be a case of his interests being affected, he says to you all to pause, but if your interests are at stake, he says 'Let me also have my finger in the pie.' I hope this will prove a 'moral lesson' to my friend Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti and also to my hon. Friend Diwan Bahadur Arogyaswami Mudaliyar."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—"Mr. President, Sir, I am afraid that there has been some misunderstanding with regard to the attitude of the Mussalmans generally in this House. I understand that this is purely a religious question, but it affects Hindu temples and Hindu charities. In purely Hindu institutions of that kind, I believe that neither Muslims nor Christians have any right either to elect members or to serve on the committees of those temples. Of course, a very pertinent question was asked by my hon. Friend Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar, namely, whether the Muslims and the Christians would allow non-Muslims or non-Christians to sit in their committees or even for that matter to elect members for such committees. I agree with him that they will not do so. But, Sir, when the Select Committee to consider this Bill was formed, I was of the opinion that there was no place for Muslims or Christians even on that committee, but to my surprise both Muslims and Christians found their way into the committee either due to the pressure of the Hindu members or of their own accord. Somehow, the committee met and it has come to a decision. Of course, there is no doubt that we ought, as far as possible, not to divide this House into groups. If it were a political matter, I should certainly not have been a party to forming separate groups for purposes of election, but I find, in this case, it is a purely religious question. So, I do not think that either the Muslims or the Christians have any place either in the electorate or much less on the committee. Therefore, Sir, I am afraid, I have to oppose the amendment of Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar."

Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar:—"I move—

'*that the question be now put*'."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"I second it, Sir."

3rd August 1932]

* Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Mr. President, Sir, I had no intention of taking part in this debate. Really speaking all this trouble would not have arisen if the Members of the Select Committee had considered the matter whether the Legislative Council was the proper constituency for electing the members of the governing body of this temple. In fact, they have adopted this wrong constituency, and that is the real cause of all this trouble. When once you have decided to have the whole Legislative Council as the constituency, I think it is but proper that all the Members should have the vote. I am sorry to see Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti and Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar, whom I have taken to be opponents of communal electorates of all kinds standing in their seats here and supporting this motion. I am glad, Mr. Pannirselvam has explained to them their real position. (Hear, hear.) I hope next time when they rise in their seat they would be at least careful to be consistent with the political theories they put forward. (Laughter.) But once when they have come to this Council and when once they have made this Council the electorate for electing members of the Devasthanam Committee, it is but fair and just that all Members of the Council should be given the right to elect. I am sure my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, does not go beyond that. He does not want to elect a Christian, or a Muhammadan, or a European for the matter of that, to be a member of the managing committee of a Hindu temple. What he says is, once you have made the Legislative Council the constituency, he being a Member of the Legislative Council, he should have the right to vote for a Hindu Member. I think he is quite right. (Hear, hear.) If you don't want to give a vote to Members of the Council other than Hindus, then devise a different electorate a Hindu electorate. But when once you are making the Legislative Council as the electorate I for myself would vote for every Member of this Council having a right to elect members to this Committee." (Hear, hear.) 3-4 p.m

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I take it the House is now ready for a vote. The question is—

' that in clause 6 (1), the word " Hindu " be omitted '."

The amendment was put and declared lost. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar demanded a poll and the House divided thus :—

Ayes.

1. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.
2. Dr. P. Subbarayan.
3. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
4. Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
5. Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar.
6. Mr. F. E. James.
7. ,, V. T. Arasu.
8. ,, H. M. Jagannatham.
9. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
10. Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan.
11. Mr. G. R. Premayya.
12. S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.

Noes.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur.
2. ,, Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
3. ,, Sir Archibald Campbell.
4. ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
5. ,, Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
6. ,, Mr. P. T. Rajan.
7. ,, Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
8. Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
9. Mr. C. E. Jones.
10. ,, J. A. Thorne.
11. ,, H. M. Hood.
12. ,, R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
13. ,, S. H. Slater.
14. ,, F. Conran Smith.
15. ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
16. Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.
17. Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
18. Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam.
19. Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj.
20. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
21. Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
22. ,, M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar.
23. Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
24. ,, M. S. Sreshta.
25. ,, P. C. Moses.
26. ,, C. Indriah.
27. ,, P. Bayappa Reddi.
28. Mr. T. Narasa Reddi.
29. ,, R. M. Palat.
30. The Raja of Bobbili.
31. The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.
32. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
33. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
34. ,, A. V. Bhanoji Rao.
35. ,, J. A. Davis.
36. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti.
37. Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami.
38. ,, K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu.
39. ,, Mahboob Ali Baig.
40. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
41. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
42. Rao Bahadur T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
43. Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
44. ,, A. B. Shetty.
45. ,, G. Simhachalam Pantulu.
46. ,, Abdul Hameed Khan.
47. ,, A. Pl. N. V. Nadimuthu Pillai.
48. The Pattagar of Palayakottai.
49. Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
50. ,, K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.
51. ,, K. Singam Ayyangar.
52. ,, A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
53. ,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
54. Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi.
55. Mr. J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
56. ,, C. Satyanarayana Choudari.
57. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
58. Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
59. Mr. G. Sriramulu.

Neutral.

1. Diwan Bahadur Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar.
2. Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
3. ,, M. Devadasan.
4. ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
5. Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
6. Mr. Daniel Thomas.
7. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
8. Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur.
9. Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
10. ,, K. Koti Reddi.
11. ,, F. J. Stanes.

Ayes 12. *Noes* 59. *Neutral* 11.

The amendment was lost.

* Mr. C. SATYANARAYANA CHOUDARI :—" Mr President, Sir, I beg to move—

> ' *In line* 1 for *the wrod* " *seven* " substitute *the word* " *nine*," *and after the word* " *determine* " insert *the words* " *who shall be elected by the Advisory Council consisting of the representatives of the ryots of the devasthanams* " *referred to in clause* 28.'

" Now, Sir, this amendment is based upon the very first principle of democracy, namely, no representation, no taxation; where there is taxation there ought to be representation. Now, Sir, this principle is also a principle of commonsense. It is only fair that a person who pays a tax ought to have an effective control over the expenditure of the money that he pays. There are about

3rd August 1932] [Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari]

four taluks belonging to the Tirupati Devasthanam. The ryots living in these taluks pay by way of taxes an amount of nearly seven lakhs. That is nearly half the total annual income of the devasthanam, which is about 16 lakhs. My amendment seeks to secure for the ryots of these four taluks effective representation on the committee proposed under the Bill, the proposal being that two of the places on the committee should be filled up by election by the ryots of the Advisory Committee provided for in clause 28 of the Bill. As it stands, the Bill makes no provision for an effective voice for the ryots residing in these four taluks belonging to the devasthanam. Therefore, Sir, I beg to move that my amendment be accepted by the House."

* Mr. V. T. Arasu:—"Sir, I have great pleasure in seconding the motion of my Friend, Mr. Satyanarayana Choudari. Sir, it is but proper that those who contribute towards the income of the temple should have a voice in its management. The total income of this devasthanam is estimated at about 16 lakhs, of which nearly seven lakhs are contributed by the tenants in the zamindari area. Therefore I submit that those who contribute as much as about 50 per cent of the total revenue should be given a voice in its expenditure by giving them at least two seats in the proposed committee."

* Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—"Mr. President, Sir, the object of the Bill is not to safeguard the interest of the ryot, but it is to safeguard the interest of the temple. If the ryots are to be given a representation, then I am afraid the interests of the temple would be very much affected. The committee has to decide very many questions affecting the tenants and ryots of the devasthanam, and if, in that committee, representation is to be given to the ryots then there will be on the committee persons who will influence the other members, which may be detrimental to the interests of the temple. For this reason I oppose this amendment. Further with a view to help the cause of the ryots there is the Advisory Committee, to which proper representation has been conceded to the ryots. The representations of this committee will be given due weight by the general committee. For these reasons I oppose the amendment."

* Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar:—"Sir, I also oppose the amendment. Because the people who ought to have a voice in the management of the institution should be the general public, that is, the worshippers, and so I do not know why the ryots as such should have any voice in it. The ryots as worshippers will have a voice in the management of the institution, and they will represent their views. The ryots are the electors for the Legislative Council. As such they have ample scope to represent their views. If the amendment is accepted it will amount to this. Suppose a bungalow or a house is bought from the devasthanam funds and that house is let; then the tenant also will want to have a voice in it as he is the tenant of the house bought from the devasthanam funds. Such a thing will be unthinkable. The whole thing was considered in the Select Committee stage, and finally the Select Committee came to the conclusion that the

[Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar] [3rd August 1932

ryots' position was amply safeguarded. Therefore I don't think this amendment is necessary."

4 p.m. Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" I rise to oppose the motion for the reason that the argument advanced is fallacious. Persons who pay homage (kanika) come not only from three taluks but from various parts of India. If that principle is advocated the whole of India has got to be constituted into a constituency. Therefore it is certainly unworkable. It is not practicable. The other argument also seems to be fallacious. As pointed out by Mr. Rathnasabhapati Mudaliyar, the rate-payers of these taluks are people interested in the devasthanam properties in that they happen to be tenants and they will always be amenable to local influence. So, we will be ill-advised to give any representation to them."

* Mr. C. SATYANARAYANA CHOUDARI:—" I am really surprised at the attitude of the Mover of the Bill and Mr. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar. There are two classes of people here, Sir—the general worshippers who may pay or who may not pay and whose contribution is of a doubtful nature. The only amount about which the devasthanam can be sure of, is that contributed by the ryots. We are providing representation in this Bill to those general worshippers whose contribntions are of a doubtful nature by providing four seats through the Legislative Council. It is really unfair that this Council should have any objection to make provision for the representation of the ryots whose coutribution is the only guaranteed income for the devasthanam. Section 37 of the Bill provides for the expenditure of the surplus amounts that may be found available after meeting the necessary customary expenditure of the temple. I once more beg to submit it is but fair and reasonable that the ryots inhabiting the four taluks who contribute such a large sum as seven lakhs which comes nearly to half of the total income ought to be provided a place on the committee so that they may have some voice in the way of administering these surplus funds as contemplated by section 37. The hon. Mover of the Bill and others who opposed it have not given any cogent reasons why this amendment should not be accepted. When they contribute such a large amount as seven lakhs we will be perfectly justified in providing them with seats on the committee. Therefore I once again appeal to the House to take a more reasonable and practical view of the matter and accept my amendment and do justice to the ryots."

* Mr. G. SIMHACHALAM PANTULU:—" I am really sorry to have to oppose the amendment. The suggestion made is neither sound in principle nor a workable proposition. If elections are conducted and representation is to be given surely this institution will never work. It must be placed in the hands of disinterested persons. Persons with vested interests ought not to be given a place. Here there is no question of the administration; it is only management of the affairs of a trust and disinterested people ought to be there. For the ryot to claim a voice in the administration of affairs there is absolutely no justification. It is not their own money. It is the money of the shrine.

3rd August 1932] [Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu]

I do not see why the ryot should have a voice in a matter like this. As one connected with religious institutions I think if representations are given on democratic lines it will not only not work properly but will also work havoc."

The amendment was put and lost.

Clause 6 was put and carried.

Clauses 7, 8, 8-A, 9 and 10 were successively put and carried.

Clauses 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 were then successively put and carried.

Clause 18.

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" I beg to move—

'*In clause* 18 *between the words* " *Commissioner* " *and* " *who* " insert *the words* " *from among the officers in service of the Government* ".'

" The object in bringing this motion is to see that the selection for commissionership of the devasthanam should be restricted to those who are in the active service of the Government. This point was placed before the Select Committee and the Select Committee was pleased to agree to that provision in the first instance. But latterly it revised its opinion and omitted that restriction. My objection to appointments being made from outside the active Government service is this. In the first place, when we decide to transfer the power of management of a big estate like this from one individual to a body on the ground that the administration of a single individual is liable to be abused and is liable to lead to several instances of mismanagement it is necessary for the Council to take care that the change we are proposing to-day will not lead to the same defects and to the same abuses. In the case of the Mahant, who has been managing this institution, no specific instance of mismanagement could be proved against him. There is a general belief that the power vested in a single individual is liable to abuses and we are thoroughly justified in such assumption. The Bill now makes provision for the appointment of a committee in the place of the Mahant. The powers exercised hitherto by one single individual are to be exercised by a body and that body would be a controlling body, the chief executive function vesting with the commissioner. These committees, however efficient they may be and however representative they may be, cannot be expected to exercise the executive functions in as efficient a manner as one individual under their direction would be able to do. Naturally therefore large powers will devolve upon this executive officer. We therefore expect that executive officer to be a thoroughly honest, active and efficient man. Of course these are the characteristics which might be claimed by any individual that may be appointed and these are the characteristics which are called for by the employers. We are not quite so helpless as to rely mainly upon the claims made either by the appointor or upon the claims made by the appointee. There are certain services which would guarantee to us certain amount of honesty and efficiency, such as a Government service. Government service ordinarily

[Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti] [3rd August 1932

4-15 p.m. ensures a certain amount of check. The officers in Government service do always look to their promotion, emoluments, increments and pensions by their good conduct and their honest and efficient service. They are not such free lances as those who are not in Government service. There is no guarantee that those people who are not in Government service and who may be appointed as commissioners, if ever they commit wrong, will be accountable to any superior authority. But in the case of Government officers there is the system which regulates their conduct, and people will have the confidence and security that the institution is being managed by an officer whose probity is recognized by the Government. There is also another danger of inefficient men becoming commissioners of these devasthanams if the choice is extended beyond the Government service. The appointment has got to be made either from Government service, I admit, or from outside it by the Minister in charge of the subject. But yet the number of applications that might be made to him would be certainly fewer if the choice is restricted only to the Government service. Then he will not have the delicate task of weighing the qualifications, and, what is more difficult, the influence and the recommendations which those who are outside the Government service would bring to bear upon the Ministry. I dare say the hon. Minister himself will feel greatly relieved if the choice is restricted to Government servants, because he would to that extent be less worried about this appointment. During the stage of the introduction of this Bill, much stress was laid upon the necessity of placing the affairs of these devasthanams in the hands of an executive officer who could be relied on for continuous good conduct. It is only in that spirit that I have ventured to make this amendment. I think hon. Members sitting on the other side of the House, some at any rate, are also of that opinion. I hope the hon. Minister himself will see the necessity of instilling confidence in the minds of the public by placing the affairs of these devasthanams in the hands of officers whose character and whose conduct is sufficiently guaranteed by the mere fact of their being included in Government serivce."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I second it."

* Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, though at one stage of the Select Committee, we were in favour of restricting the choice only to Government officers, afterwards I had to yield to the wishes of the majority of the Members of the Select Committee who did not want such a restriction. The clause in the Bill as amended by the Select Committee therefore appears better. Everyone admits that the commissioner's post is the most important one under this Bill. As such, I am afraid the choice should not be restricted to Government officers alone. In view of the importance of the post, the field of choice should be very large, so that the best man can be selected for the post. In these days, for every superior Government appointment, whether it be to the judiciary or other departments, we want direct appointments. Thus, while we are against the appointment of persons from the ranks, I cannot understand the

3rd August 1932] [Mr. C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar]

logic of my hon. Friend Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti that for this appointment, only Government servants should be selected. This question was discussed at great length in all its bearings in the Select Committee stage, and having come to that conclusion I am sorry I am not for receding in favour of the amendment of my hon. Friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" Mr. President, my surprise to-day is the greatest I have ever had in the matter of somersaults, such as the one my hon. Friend, Mr. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar, has made now. It is only an hour ago, Sir, he agreed with me on the merits of the question and even told me that he asked Mr. Khalif-ul-lah to table a motion to the same effect. Of course, I anticipated that it was very unlikely that he would vote for an amendment of this kind, when it came before the Council. But I did not really bargain for a speech of that sort finding arguments for a somersault. That unpleasant task might have been left to some other Member who really believed in the matter. I therefore withdraw the amendment."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

Clause 18 was put and carried.

Clause 18-*A*.

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, with reference to clause 18-A, I find some difficulty. To begin with I find there is no definition of the term 'Hindu.' What is a Hindu? Is Sir Patro, who is Brahmo, a Hindu? Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar is a Theosophist; is he a Hindu? Coming next to the term 'professing the Hindu religion, I think, Sir, here again there is no definition to guide us. I am therefore in a difficulty as to what exactly the term 'professing the Hindu religion' means. The Hindu religion is not a dogmatic religion. For instance, you can determine whether a man is a professing Roman Catholic or not. But in the case of the Hindu religion, it allows the widest possible range of beliefs. A man may be anything and still be a Hindu. I appeal to my hon. Friend the Advocate-General to enlighten me on the point. I expected in a Bill like this at least the term 'Hindu' and the term 'Hindu religion' would be defined; but there are no such definitions in this Bill."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" I think my hon. Friend's speech to-day has justified the position we have taken in respect of the word 'Hindu' being retained in that section. I quite sympathize with his complete lack of information with regard to who is a Hindu and who is not. That is why we held that such people are disentitled to vote for elections to a Hindu institution."

* Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—" It is clear from the position which was taken up by hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar that the electorate should comprise of no others than Hindus. Because he is not able to distinguish between who is a Hindu and who is not. If such a right of electing members to a Hindu institution is conceded to Christians or others, we do not know where we will be."

[3rd August 1932

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar :—" It is not a question of conceding electoral rights to others. What I should like to know is whether there is any definition of the term 'Hindu' or 'Hindu religion.' "

Diwan Bahadur Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar :—" I did not wish to interpose in the debate. I do not think there has been a judicial definition of the Hindu religion. But there is a judicial definition of the expression 'Hindu'; that is to say, one belonging to the community called Hindu which is well known in India. It is the members of that community who are governed by the Hindu law. The expression 'Hindu' has come up before the courts and has been judicially interpreted. Evidently the framers of the Bill meant 'by professing the Hindu religion' those belonging to the community well known as Hindus."

Clause 18-A was put and carried.

Clauses 19 to 35 were then put and carried.

Clause 36.

* Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" Sir, I move the following amendment:—

> '*In clause* 36 (v), *after the words " the lighting thereof "*, add *the words " for the convenience of the pilgrims and worshippers."* '

" The House will find that with regard to the diversion and utilization of the funds, in every one of the objects for which this utilization was provided there is a phrase meaning that these improvements and amenities should be for the benefit and relief of the pilgrims and worshippers, whereas in the case of roads, communications and the lighting thereof, that is omitted. The probable inference from such an omission would be that with regard to the construction and maintenance of roads and communications and the lighting thereof, the money could be spent even outside the district, which I am sure is not the object of the framers of the Bill. It must be merely by an unintentional omission that that phrase is not there. I would therefore suggest that the words 'for the convenience of the pilgrims' may be added."

Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu :—" I second it."

* Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar :—" I have no objection to accepting the amendment in the form 'for the convenience of the pilgrims and worshippers'."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" I accept it and my amendment be framed accordingly."

* The hon. the President :—" The question is—

> '*in clause* 36 (v) *after the words " lighting thereof "* add *the words " for the convenience of the pilgrims and worshippers "* '."

The amendment was carried.

3rd August 1932]

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"Sir, with your permission, I just want to move a small amendment with regard to item (vi) in clause 36. I cannot really find a proper word for it. I would request the help of my hon. Friend, the Advocate-General, with regard to this sub-clause dealing with the training of archakas to perform the religious worship and ceremonies in the devasthanams. I want to include in this training those people who perform what is called '*Sevakalam*.' You are aware, Sir, the Advocate-General is also aware, what is called Seva which follows a procession. Recently there has been a large reduction in the number of those who attend to the Sevas. That is because there has not been much encouragement for them to take up to this particular service of God.

"I would like that provision be made for the training of such people. They are not included in the category of archakas, because 4-3 p.m. they stand on a different footing. There are particular forms of service in Vaishnava temples, which is not the service of archakas or other class of people. That service has been in existence for a long time. Of late that service is gradually dying out for want of encouragement. I want people to be trained in the particular kind of service. I cannot find the exact word to define that service. I therefore appeal to the Advocate-General for assistance; and if that amendment be allowed at the third reading, I shall be glad."

Mr. R. Madanagopal Nayudu:—"That service is the chanting of *Nalayiram* and *Vedam*."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—"The wording of the clause is very elastic. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti is afraid that when we say the training of archakas the meaning of the phrase is very much restricted. I think his difficulty will be met if you say 'archakas and others'."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"That will introduce some other confusion. We want only a particular kind of archakas. If you say 'others' it may mean anything. I would like to guard myself against it. I would therefore defer it to the third reading of the Bill; as the hon. Minister has agreed to this, I think there will be no objection to my amendment."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"In clause 36 we have provided for what may be considered to be normal services to be perfomed in the temple. Whether any further restrictions should be made to the services is a question which cannot be answered offhand. I would certainly examine the amendment of my hon. Friend and if there is no objection I shall agree to it."

Clause 36, as amended, was put and carried.

Clause 37.

Diwan Bahadur Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar:—"I propose '*that for the words "not inconsistent with" the words "consistent with and calculated to promote" be substituted.*'

[3rd August 1932

[Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar]

"Hon. Members will at once see what the object of the amendment is. The main principle of this clause is to give effect to what is technically known as the Cypres doctrine. 'Not inconsistent with' is not a happy expression. I am quite alive to the fact that it occurs in the original Endowments Act, but it is not a correct rendering of the doctrine of Cypres. I trust hon. Members will have no difficulty in accepting my amendment as it will bring the language of this section in line with the well accepted principle of Cypres."

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON:—"I second it."

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"The doctrine of Cypres will bring great confusion in the interpretation and administration of this particular clause. The clause as it stands is working satisfactorily. In the Hindu Religious Endowments Act, section 67, we have got this phrase 'not inconsistent with', and no difficulty has arisen so far. So I shall urge on the House to accept the language of the original Act instead of the alteration proposed by the learned Advocate-General, as we do not know to what extent this my lead us to. I do not say he has said anything very technical. The amendment is restrictive. It is only a commonsense view and such as we find in ordinary experience. Ordinary experience will guide us as much as possible and avoid loopholes that may lead to litigation. To-morrow, some one taking advantage of the Cypres doctrine may file an application and may lead to great trouble and expense for the temple. Therefore I would adhere to the language already accepted, which would cause no inconvenience whatever."

* Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR:—"I will support the amendment that has been moved by the Advocate-General, with the latter portion left out which would bring in the Cypres doctrine as well understood and which he wants to be embodied in this Bill. There is a lot of difference between the Hindu Religious Endowment Bill and this Bill. That Bill deals both with mutts and temples. And the idea is if with reference to a mutt the disciples of a mutt and the Guru agree upon a certain form of expenditure which is likely to promote the object of the mutt, others need not interfere. That is the object with which the words 'not inconsistent with' were used there. My Friend Sir Patro said that we have not felt any difficulty in the administration of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act so far. I ask him whether any occasion has arisen for the application of this principle in the past? To my knowledge it has not arisen, at any time. There is another point also. We are not here giving an indefinite power for the people to spend their money. In section 37 itself, we are specifying the objects on which after incurring the necessary expenditure of the temples the balances can be spent. I do not think there can be any difficulty in finding ways in which money can be spent. There is no reason why we should introduce a general clause giving wide freedom to spend the money as they choose without reference to the wishes of the people concerned. As I submitted at the beginning, we are dealing with a particular temple; it is not that we are making a

3rd August 1932] [Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar]

general rule for all the temples. So the amendment of the Advocate-General seems reasonable, but I would retain the words 'consistent with' and leave out the further restriction implied in 'calculated to promote'; because it will become a difficult matter for decision if it goes to Court. The words 'consistent with' would bring out the general idea of the Cypres doctrine."

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"No doubt as explained by the Advocate-General, the amendment is intended to restrict the scope of that clause. His object seems to be that the expenditure should be confined to the purposes not only not prohibited by but also consistent with them. But here 'not inconsistent with' is a wider term and means 'not actually prohibited by or repugnant to'. This expression is apparently borrowed from the Hindu Religious Endowments Act itself. Therefore in regard to other temples in the Presidency that clause applies, and there is no reason why that wording should not be adopted with regard to this particular temple.

"Moreover, this temple would have been brought within the scope of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act but for the fact there was a scheme framed or approved by the Privy Council, and this Bill is introduced really to do away with that scheme as far as possible, and see that the administration of the temple is brought into line with temples governed by the Hindu Religious Endowments Act. If this is the object I see no reason why any distinction should be made as to the application of the surplus funds. Unless of course any useful purpose is going to be served by restricting the scope, the amendment should not be adopted. This is a temple where very large sums of money are available, and if they are to be spent only for the purposes for which the institution came into being, I think so much money will be practically wasted. For these reasons this amendment should not be accepted."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Mr. President, much stress was laid on the fact that the same phrase 'not inconsistent with' exists in the Hindu Religious Endowments Act. Well, Sir, that phrase was accepted in the sense that no money would be spent on objects which are not consistent with the objects of the Hindu devasthanams. If to-day we are informed that that phrase does not carry out the full significance and the meaning it had when we passed it, I think it is up to us to correct it not only with reference to this Bill but also with regard to the other Act. If the hon. Advocate-General with his experience of law and experience of instances of disputes arising on account of indefinite and vague phrases occurring in enactments ventures an opinion and says that the proper phraseology would be 'consistent with' instead of 'not inconsistent with' I should defer to his opinion as against the opinion of other gentlemen who do not base their opinion on the study of the law, but upon experience gained in the administration of the previous Act. Even that experience, if examined, as pointed out by Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar is nothing. No case has arisen so far as that particular Act is concerned where it has

[Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti] [3rd August 1932

been decided that 'not inconsistent with' carries the same significance as 'consistent with.' Therefore that experience does not stand in good stead to oppose the motion of the Advocate-General.

"Now, with regard to the actual phrase itself, it seems necessary to point out that 'not inconsistent with' might mean anything; for instance, utilization of funds to promote other religions may not be inconsistent with the objects of the devasthanam, because the Hindu religion thinks that all religions have got a place in the world; it has no bias or prejudice against other religions. It considers itself as one religion and it also gives room to many other religions existing in the world. It could not be said that the funds that would be devoted for the purpose of, say, Muslim religion or Christian religion, may not be not inconsistent with the objects of the devasthanam, but still it is not consistent with objects of the devasthanam. So the intention must be to utilize the funds of the devasthanam for the purposes for which this devasthanam was founded or endowed by donors.

4-45 p.m. "That was consistently the attitude taken even with regard to the framing of sections in other Acts. From the provisions as they exist in the Bill at present, you will find that roads may be used by people other than pilgrims, hospitals may be used by others than those for whom they are intended, and so also schools and choultries by people other than those for whom they are intended. The object of the Act should be to make these things pre-eminently intended in the first place for those people who have got an interest in the devasthanams and latterly to other things. Therefore with regard to the diversion of funds it is really very important that we must go by the interpretation of law. With regard to the interpretation of law, I do not think we need go to any other quarter than the Advocate-General. I therefore support his amendment."

Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR:—"Apparently there is a feeling of doubt as to the particular meaning that will have to be attached to the words 'not inconsistent with' and the words 'consistent with'. The learned Advocate-General says that he wants to simply copy the words expressed in the English Law on the subject. Whatever that might be, when we are going to consider these two negative words, later on, legal ingenuity will certainly be exercised to as great an extent as possible. *Prima facie* the words 'not inconsistent with' and the words 'consistent with' do not connote the same idea. Therefore, we have to see what words will give a wider scope and a liberal interpretation. I think as we are progressing every day we cannot be hidebound with regard to the utilization of funds for the purposes for which the devasthanam funds should be utilized. The idea of yesterday is not the same to-day. We have far advanced. We may hereafter have some definite idea for which the surplus funds of the Tirupati Devasthanam should be used. It is very clear that as we are progressing we may be confronted with new schemes of expenditure in future. If the amendment of the learned Advocate-General is accepted it may land us in difficulties. Questions will arise as to what

3rd August 1932] [Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar]

are the purposes for which the surplus funds should be used. But the words ' not inconsistent with ' gave us a wider scope and latitude to use the funds of the devasthanams for purposes which for the time being we may consider essential. Hindu religion is so wide as to include every form of activity. If the expression ' consisteut with ' is used it may be said to-morrow that a certain purpose for which we want to utilize the funds is not consistent with the objects of the Act and that the Legislature did not contemplate it. That is how any High Court Judge will construe the section. Therefore, I would suggest that the words ' not inconsistent with ' which is a wider expression may be retained."

* Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, I have to oppose this amendment. I am not a vakil to enter into the merits of this question. I agree with Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar in thinking that the clause should be retained as it stands. In view of sub-clauses 37 (1) and (2), I do not see any harm in having this clause as it is. I want that the provisions of this Act should be consistent with the provisions of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act. With due deference to the learned Advocate-General I should say that the clause should stand as it is."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" Sir, the amendment wants to restrict the application of surplus funds to purposes which are ' consistent ' with the objects of the endowments."

Diwan Bahadur Sir ALLADI KRISHNASWAMI AYYAR :—" I fiud it difficult to understand the double negative."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" It is not merely a question of grammar. If you say that the funds should be utilized for objects which are ' consistent with ' the objects of the institution, the scope of utilization is restricted. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti said that the words ' not inconsistent with ' may include objects which are ' not consistent with ' the objects of the institution, and he even went to the extent of saying that not only should we amend the clause here, but also it is necessary to amend the provision in the Hindu Religious Endowments Act as well. These words ' not inconsistent with ' are found in that Act. Even at the time when that Act was enacted, I remember that a very strong agitation was made that the words ' not inconsistent with ' should be modified as suggested now, but the Council on both occasions when that Act was considered voted in favour of retaining the words ' not inconsistent with '. We are merely importing that very section into this Bill. I therefore think that if you want to avoid the possibility of another agitation to amend the Hindu Religious Endowments Act it is preferable to continue the existing wording ' not inconsistent with '. I would rather say that as a matter of policy this Council has adopted that expression on two different occasions and I do not see any reason why we should not adopt the same now. I, therefore, oppose the amendment."

* Diwan Bahadur Sir ALLADI KRISHNASWAMI AYYAR :—" The only reason why I brought forward the amendment is because I find it

[Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar] [3rd August 1932

difficult to understand the import of the double negative 'not inconsistent with' in the context. I could well understand purposes which are inconsistent with a foundation and purposes which are consistent with a foundation. How is a Court of Law or the Endowments Board to find out purposes which are not inconsistent with a particular purpose. It would be a difficult task for the Endowment Board or even for the Court to give directions for utilization of funds not inconsistent with the purposes. One of the hon. Members stated that the expression occurs in the Religious Endowments Act. But for the fact that I owed it to myself by virtue of my office as the 'Protector' of charities to bring to the notice of the House what exactly is the correct principle that has to be adopted in regard to the application of funds devoted to charitable purposes I should never have interposed in this debate. I may mention that long before I assumed my present office, writing in the Madras Law Journal, I commented upon the expression 'not inconsistent with' occurring in the original Religious Endowments Bill. I should like to explain the principle underlying my amendment to my hon. Friends who are progressives, or at least some of them. It is not right that we should trade upon the credulity of other people who are making their offerings to these temples in the belief that the surplus funds are going to be utilized for certain purposes which are dear to their heart. To take an example: suppose a chair is started for examining the foundations of religious belief; it may be a very good thing to do from the point of view of some people. If such a chair is started nobody can affirmatively say according to the Bill as it stands at present that such a purpose is inconsistent with the objects of the Devasthanam although it may not be consistent. Or again, take the case of a chair for examining the foundations of idol worship. It may be difficult to state that such a foundation is inconsistent with the purposes of the Devasthanam though the foundation may not be consistent with and calculated to promote the purposes of the Devasthanam. I therefore ask hon. Members consistently with the dominant motive and intention of the people making the offerings to accept the amendment. I believe I have done my duty as '*Protector of Charities*' *in respect of religious institutions* by bringing this point to the notice of this House and it does not matter a bit to me what exactly is the fate of this amendment."

The amendment was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

1. Dr. P. Subbarayan.
2. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
3. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
4. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
5. Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
6. Rao Bahadur T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
7. Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu.
8. ,, K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
9. ,, A. Pl. N. V. Nadimuthu Pillai.
10. ,, K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.
11. ,, P. Peddi Raju.
12. Diwan Bahadur Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar.
13. Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.

Noes.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur.
2. ,, Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
3. ,, Sir Archibald Campbell.
4. ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
5. ,, Mr. P. T. Rajan.
6. ,, Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
7. Mr. C. E. Jones.
8. ,, J. A. Thorne.
9. ,, H. M. Hood.
10. ,, R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
11. ,, S. H. Slater.
12. ,, E. Conran Smith.
13. ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
14. Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.
15. Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam.
16. Mr. K. C. M. Venkatachala Reddiyar.
17. ,, M. Devadasan.
18. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
19. Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
20. Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar.
21. Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
22. ,, P. C. Moses.
23. ,, C. Indriah.
24. ,, P. Bayappa Reddi.
25. ,, T. Narasa Reddi.
26. The Raja of Kallikote.
27. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
28. Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao.
29. ,, Daniel Thomas.
30. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
31. Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami.
32. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.
33. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
34. The Maharaja of Venkatagiri.
35. Mr. G. Sriramulu.
36. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
37. Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi.
38. ,, A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
39. ,, K. Koti Reddi.
40. ,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
41. ,, J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
42. ,, C. Satyanarayana Choudari.

Ayes 13. Noes 42.

The amendment was lost.

Clause 37 was put and carried.

Clauses 38 to 49 were put successively and carried.

Schedules I and II were put and carried.

The Preamble was put and carried.

The House adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m the next day.

XXXIII. PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

[1] *Statement showing additions and reductions in non-voted appropriations sanctioned during the year* 1931–32.

[2] *G.O. No.* 2922, *L. & M., dated* 26*th July* 1932, *fixing the date of retirement of members of district and taluk boards in the Madura district.*

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

1 Printed separately.

2 Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette.*

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to question No. 63 asked by Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 3rd August 1932, page 165 supra.]

Statement showing the number of motor vehicles under each class that paid tax for one or more quarters of 1931–32.

District.	Buses.	Lorries.	Motor cars.	Motor cycles.
Agency Division	2	10	5	3
Ganjam	57	11	134	25
Vizagapatam	131	52	302	43
East Godavari	144	7	170	38
West Godavari	31	..	69	16
Kistna	103	10	79	15
Guntur	99	11	86	15
Nellore	70	3	69	..
Cuddapah	56	2	35	6
Anantapur	40	7	32	4
Bellary	93	34	127	11
Kurnool	92	17	47	2
Chingleput	145	26	39	10
Chittoor	65	9	66	4
North Arcot	180	10	133	13
South Arcot	70	5	67	15
Tanjore	167	15	236	15
Trichinopoly	146	33	1,060	58
Madura	314	41	275	30
Ramnad	244	16	337	8
Tinnevelly	168	9	182	37
Coimbatore	283	96	540	148
Nilgiris	73	209	632	129
Salem	202	11	146	46
South Kanara	167	33	208	33
Malabar	228	38	489	74
North Malabar	11	2	53	20
South Malabar	5	..	8	13
City	502	291	5,633	1,228
Foreign	283	29	1,255	188
Total ..	4,171	1,037	12,514	2,247

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 81 asked by Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 3rd August 1932, page 182 supra.]

Copy of letter from Dr. N. Ganesha Pai, Nileshwar, South Kanara, dated Kanhangad, the 2nd March 1932.

I most humbly beg to bring the following for your kind persal and sympathetic consideration.

To-day at about 10 a.m., at Kanhangad, two Congress volunteers with a national flag and some printed Congress pamphlets were marching in a procession along the main road from north to south. I was seated in a coffee club just close to the road. The volunteers were stopped on the road a few yards north of the coffee club by a posse of reserve police. It was only then that the passers-by began to collect near them. Then the police asked the crowd to disperse. The crowd melted away leaving the two volunteers alone on the road. The national flag and the pamphlets were forcibly snatched from their hands and they were ordered to go back which they refused. Then the police began to beat the volunteers with lathis and canes until they fell on the ground. Then they were raised up and again beaten with lathis and canes, and then again they were dragged along the road for nearly a furlong. The Local Fund Dispensary was only a few yards away from the place of action. But the police dragged the volunteers along the road and were left unconscious one and a half furlongs away to the north of the hospital on the road itself. After nearly half an hour the volunteers—it seems—gained consciousness and were helped by some of the passers-by to the railway station. I came to know at about 12-15 that the volunteers were lying in the railway station untreated and unlooked for. So I went to the station and brought them in a car to the Local Fund Dispensary at about 1 p.m. They received first aid only at 1 o'clock though they were beaten and left at about 10-30 a.m. Proper treatment was available only at 3 p.m. I understand that there is no section 144 promulgated here.

Therefore I request most humbly to do the needful in the matter.

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

Thursday, the 4th August 1932.

The House met in the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at eleven of the clock, Mr. President (the hon. Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI) in the Chair.

PRESENT :

Usman Sahib Bahadur, *Kt.*, The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed.
Krishnan Nayar, *Kt.*, The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M.
Campbell, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., O.B.E., V.D., I.C.S., The hon. Sir Archibald.
Stokes, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. H. G.
Muniswami Nayudu, The hon. Diwan Bahadur B.
Rajan, The hon. Mr. P. T.
Kumaraswami Reddiyar, The hon. Diwan Bahadur S.
Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.
Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur.
Alamelumangathayaramma, Mrs. K.
Arasu, Mr. V. T.
Ari Gowder, Mr. H. B.
Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur R. N.
Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
Basu Dev, Mr. C.
Bayappa Reddi, Mr. P.
Beyabani Sahib Bahadur, S. M. K.
Bhanoji Rao, Mr. A. V.
Birley, Mr. F.
Devadasan, Mr. M.
Dharmalingam Pillai, Rao Sahib V.
Ellappa Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur S.
Gopalaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur M.
Harischandrudu Nayudu, Mr. A.
Hood, I.C.S., Mr. H. M.
Indriah, Mr. C.
Jagannatham, Mr. H. M.
James, Mr. F. E.
Jones, Mr. C. E.
Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu, Mr. K.
Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur P.
Kolanda Reddi, Rai Sahib C.
Koti Reddi, Mr. K.
Krishnamurti, Rao Sahib D.
Krishnan, Mr. C.
Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri, The
Kuppuswami Choudari, Mr. J.
Lakshmana Reddi, Mr. G.
Madanagopal Nayudu, Mr. R.
Madhusoodhanan Thangal, Mr. P.
Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.
Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
Manikkavelu Nayakar, Mr. M. A.
Moidoo Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur T. M.
Moses, Mr. P. C.
Muniswami Pillai, Rao Sahib V. I.
Muthiah Chettiyar, Mr. M. A.
Muthu Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur P. C.
Nachiyappa Gounder, Mr. K. A.
Nadimuthu Pillai, Mr. A. Pl. N. V.
Nanjappa Bahadur, Subadar-Major S. A.
Narasa Reddi, Mr. T.
Narasimhaswami, Mr. D. V.
Narayanan Nambiyar, Mr. V. P.
Narayanaswami Pillai, Rao Bahadur T. M.
Natesa Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur C.
Palat, Mr. R. M.
Pannirselvam, Rao Bahadur A. T.
Parthasarathi Ayyangar, Mr. C. R.
Patnaik Mahasayo, Sriman M. G.
Patro, *Kt.*, Rao Bahadur Sir A. P.
Pattagar of Palayakottai, The
Peddiraju, Mr. P.
Pocker Sahib Bahadur, B.
Premayya, Mr. G. R.
Rajagopala Pillai, Mr. P. V.
Raja of Bobbili, The
Raja of Kallikote, The
Ramachandra Padayachi, Mr. P. K.
Ramalingam Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur T. A.
Ramamurti, Pandit Ganala.
Raman Menon, Mr. K. P.
Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. T. S.
Ramaswami Mudaliyar, Mr. V. M.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. A.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. G.
Rangaswami Reddi, Mr. M. B.
Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur C. S.
Sahajanandam, Swami A. S.
Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, Mr.
Satyanarayana Choudari, Mr. C.
Sesha Reddi, Mr. B. P.
Shetty, Mr. A. B.
Simhachalam Pantulu, Mr. Gade.
Siva Raj, Rao Sahib N.
Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar, Mr. K. S.
Slater, C.M.G., C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. S. H.
Smith, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. E. Conran.
Soundara Pandian, Mr. W. P. A.
Sreshta, Mr. M. S.
Srinivasa Ayyangar, Mr. T. C.

PRESENT :—*cont.*

Srinivasan, Rao Bahadur R.
Sriramulu, Mr. G.
Stanes, Mr. F. J.
Subbarayan, Dr. P.
Subrahmanyam Chetti, Rao Sahib P.
Subrahmanya Bhatt, Mr. U. C.
Sundara Rao Nayudu, Mr. T.
Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur, Khan Sahib.
Thomas, Mr. Daniel.
Thorne, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. J. A.
Venkatachala Reddiyar, Mr. K. C. M.
Venugopal Nayudu, Rao Bahadur R. K.
Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
Zamindar of Kirlampudi, The
Zamindar of Mirzapuram, The

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS

Labour

Action taken by the Government on the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Labour.

* 91 *Q.*—Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state what action has been taken by the Local Government to implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Labour and when the recommendations will be brought into force so far as this Presidency is concerned ?

A.—The recommendations of the Commission, so far as this Government are concerned, involve in some cases provincial legislation and require in others administrative action by the Local Government. Others still require action by public bodies (e.g., municipalities, universities, etc.), and by employers and their organizations or by workers' unions. Those requiring action by employers have been brought to their notice by the Commissioner of Labour and the desirability of giving early and sympathetic consideration to the recommendations has been impressed on them. The recommendations regarding the housing of the industrial worker and the relief of congestion in urban and rural areas have been communicated to all municipal councils and local boards for information and necessary action. Most of the recommendations in Chapter XXII relating to the health and welfare of labourers in plantations involve legislation, and these are under detailed examination and will require time for full fruition. With reference to the Commission's recommendation regarding Maternity Benefits legislation, the hon. Member himself has given notice of a motion for leave to introduce, in the Council, a Bill on the lines of the Bombay Act. Regarding the recommendations relating to the machinery for fixing minimum wage and investigation into family budgets of labourers, proposals were called for from the Commissioner of Labour and his report which has been received is under the consideration of Government. The recommendations regarding factories are still under examination by the Commissioner of Labour and the Government are awaiting his report.

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether any provincial legislation is under the consideration of the Local Government?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"The whole question of what provincial legislation is necessary is under the consideration of the Government. It is not possible for me to say anything definite at present."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"Have the Local Government heard anything from the municipal councils and local boards as to any action they are taking on the recommendations of the Commission?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"Notice, Sir."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether the recommendations of the Commissioner of Labour with regard to minimum wage fixing machinery and investigation of family budgets of labourers will be placed on the table of the House and whether the labour unions will be consulted in the matter?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"The suggestion of the hon. Member will be considered."

Law and Order—General

The 'tali' incident.

* 92 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Mrs. L. S. Prabhu refused to take the tali got removed by Mr. Dodwell, the Joint Magistrate of Tellicherry, in lieu of her fine and whether any correspondence took place on that subject between the Government and herself and her husband; and

(*b*) if so, whether the hon. the Home Member will be pleased to place the same on the table of the House?

A.—(*a*) Mrs. L. S. Prabhu refused to take back her tali. The correspondence on the subject was with the Jail authorities and was submitted to the Government by the Inspector-General of Prisons.

(*b*) The Government are not prepared to place the correspondence on the table of the House.

Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt:—"May I know whether the refusal of Mrs. Prabhu to take back her tali is an absolute refusal or a qualified refusal?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"As far as I remember, she has refused to accept it."

[4th August 1932

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"Did she not say that she would accept it, if it was sent through her husband who had tied the *tali?*"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I think there was some such suggestion. The husband said that he would not be a party to it."

Alleged beating of certain persons in the lock-up by the Police of Bezwada.

* 93 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Police of Bezwada beat the following persons in the lock-up in Bezwada:—

(i) Bheemavarapu Ramachandra Rao, in the second week of January 1932 in the Town Police lock-up so severely that he vomitted blood;

(ii) Nikkalapudi Shivaramakrishnayya of Kummamoor on 18th January 1932 in Bezwada Town Police station;

(iii) on 27th April 1932, Mr. Nadella Kutumbaya of Katur who picketed post office, in the Bezwada Town Police lock-up; and

(iv) on 29th April 1932 Mr. Yellapeddi Subrahmanyam who distributed pamphlets in Court was beaten in the Town Police station by the sergeant and sub-inspector for refusing to reveal Congress secrets and was forced to sign some papers?

A.—The Government have no reason to suppose that the persons mentioned were ill-treated in Police custody in the manner indicated; nor are they aware of any complaints of ill-treatment preferred by these persons at the time of the alleged occurrences.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"May I know whether the leading advocates of Bezwada have not made a statement containing all these allegations against the Police?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I have not yet seen it."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Have not the Government perused the statement of the leading advocates of Bezwada, which was published in the various newspapers?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I have not received any communication as far as I remember. As the matter occurred in January I thought that no useful purpose would be served by asking for information. But, if the hon. Member thinks that I should consult the District Magistrate, I shall do so."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"I think it will be better."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Government say they have no reason to suppose that the persons mentioned were ill-treated in Police custody. May I know whether they made any enquiry before they came to this conclusion?"

4th August 1932]

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—
"We made no enquiries. But if there was any such thing, we would have surely heard of it. Hon. Members would have put some questions about it even earlier."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—"What is the meaning of the Government saying they have no reason to suppose that the volunteers were ill-treated?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—
"I have already answered that."

Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu:—"Did the Government find out whether there was any truth in the allegations of the leading advocates of Bezwada?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—
"I shall examine the question."

Police

Expenditure on feeding the Police on account of the civil disobedience movement.

* 94 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) the total expenditure incurred on feeding the Police in the province on account of the civil disobedience movement up to and since the end of March 1932, respectively; and

(*b*) whether the Police concerned were not paid their usual batta and allowance during the time they were fed by the Government; and, if they were not, the amount so saved in batta and allowance?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have not got the requisite information, but have called for it.

Forest

Withdrawal of grazing privilege in the Reserve Forests in South Kanara.

* 95 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Collector has stopped the privilege of allowing the cattle to graze in reserve forests in the districts of South Kanara since 1st June 1932;

(*b*) whether the people of Todikana village and other places filed petitions against the said order of the Collector, to the Collector; if so, whether the hon. Member will be pleased to lay the same on the table of the House; and

(*c*) what action the Government have taken on the same or propose to take?

[4th August, 1932

A.—(*a*) The Government have no information.

(*b*) Copy[a] of a petition presented to the Collector by the residents of Todikana village against an order of the Collector *closing the Todikana Reserve Forest to grazing* is placed on the table of the House.

(*c*) The Government are awaiting a report from the Collector.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"May I know whether the Collector's report has been received now?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"No."

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"May I know if the Government will consider the desirability of withdrawing their orders if they find that there are not sufficient grazing grounds in the villages adjoining the areas now closed to grazing?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I shall consider the suggestion of the hon. Member after the report of the Collector is received."

Prisons and Prisoners

Application of a political prisoner for permission to appear for the B.L. Degree Examination.

* 96 *Q*.—Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Mr. N. Bapirazu, B class political prisoner in Cuddalore jail, put in a petition asking for permission to appear for the B.L. examination;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that the permission sought for was not given; and

(*c*) if so, why?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) The Government do not consider that prisoners should be given the concession.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know why the Government do not consider that prisoners should be given this concession?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"The Government do not consider that a person who has broken the law should be allowed to appear for an examination while he is in prison."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Did not the Government give a similar concession on previous occasions?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I myself did it. But subsequently I thought it was a mistake."

---

[a] Printed as Appendix II on page 329 infra.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" May I know why he thought he had committed a mistake? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Because I think it was a mistake."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Is it not a fact that even to-day prisoners in other provinces are allowed to appear for examinations? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I am not aware of it."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—" May I know whether political prisoners who are vakils are allowed to practise after they are released? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" It will depend on the view which the High Court may take of the conduct of the vakils."

Admission into and release from the Jails in the Presidency of political prisoners for the current calendar year.

* 97 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to furnish a monthwar statement for the current calendar year showing the numbers of admission to, and release from, the various jails in the Presidency of political prisoners under each of the classes A, B, and C?

A.—The information has been called for.

Irrigation

Water-pumping station at Bethamangalam, Kolar district.

* 98 *Q.*—Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether he is aware of the existence of a water-pumping station at Bethamangalam, Kolar district;

(*b*) whether with regard to the information required by the Palar River Committee, he has called for statistics of the quantity of water-pumped at this station; and

(*c*) whether he has called for figures relating to the consumption of water from Bethamangalam tank (i) by the Gold Mines and (ii) by others?

A.—(*a*) Yes.
(*b*) & (*c*) No.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" May I ask whether the main apprehension in the minds of the ryots of the Palar ayacut is not the fact that the Mysore Government are using more water from the Bethamangalam tank than the agreement permits them to do? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" I am not aware that the fact is as stated, Sir."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I know whether the Government have taken any steps to verify whether the agreement of 1902 with regard to the Bethamangalam tank is or is not being adhered to by the Mysore Government? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" If the hon. Member means whether we have written to the Mysore Darbar, the answer is in the negative. The hon. Member himself wrote to me in April informing me that 30 million gallons of water were paid for in the Bethamangalam ayacut. That is equivalent to 57·6 million cubic feet per annum. The total amount of draw-off permitted is 72 million cubic feet. Therefore even allowing for what may be drawn off as free supply, it did not seem to me that any case is made out against the Mysore Government."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I know why the Government did not get the official figures for water used from the Bethamangalam tank by the Mysore Government? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I am not prepared to ask for information which will imply that we have doubts whether the Mysore Government are carrying out their obligation or not."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—" Was not this Palar Committee constituted by the Government? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I presume the hon. Member is referring to a Committee appointed by the Government."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—" If it is a Government Committee that calls for necessary information, what is the difficulty in calling for it and supplying the same to the Committee? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I have already explained the reasons."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—" Have the Government informed the Committee that they would not call for the information? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" We are endeavouring to collect certain information asked for by the Committee."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I ask when this Committee called for certain information, why that information has not been called for? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I must ask for notice."

The tanks situate in the Palar basin.

* 99 *Q.*—Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the tanks situated in the Palar basin in the Mysore area;

(*b*) whether all or any of these tanks are mentioned in the treaty clauses between the British and the Mysore Government or in the agreement relating to the raising of the tank-bund of the Bethamangalam tank;

4th August 1932]

(c) where the *Amanikarai tank is situate;*

(d) whether the river Palar does not drop and take from the Amanikarai tank; and

(e) whether the capacity of the above tank has not been increased in recent years ?

A.—(a) According to a statement made by the Mysore Darbar there are over 1,500 tanks in the Palar basin lying within the limits of Mysore.

(b) A few tank drainages are mentioned in the agreement of 1892 which provides that for the construction of new irrigation reservoirs across these drainages the previous consent of this Government should be obtained. The ' agreement ' of 1902 relating to the Bethamangalam tank applies to that tank only.

(c) There are two Amanikeres in the Kolar district—one, the Kolar Amanikere adjoining the town of Kolar on the east, and the other, the Somambudhi Amanikere right across the Palar, about 9 miles to the north-west of Kolar town.

(d) The Palar drops into the Somambudhi Amanikere and takes off from it.

(e) The Kolar Amanikere had its waste weir raised by six feet to store more water for the water-supply to Kolar town. Government have no information as to whether the capacity of this Somambudhi Amanikere was increased in recent years.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" With reference to the answer to clause (e), may I ask whether the non-official members of the Committee did not make a report to the Committee that it had come to their knowledge that the level of the Amanikere tank bund had been raised? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" I must ask for notice."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" Is there not in the Government records the report of one of the Executive Engineers to the effect that he found that the Amanikere tank hund level had been raised? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" I must ask for notice."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" Considering the admittedly inadequate supply of water in the Palar river, have the Government got any proposal to improve matters? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" Not at present."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" May I ask what has been the result so far of the investigations made? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" I must ask for notice."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" With reference to the answers to clauses (a) and (b), may I ask whether the list of 1,500 tanks

in the Palar basin lying within the limits of Mysore and the list of tank drainages mentioned in the agreement of 1892, will be made available to the Members of this House or at least to those interested in this question?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"I will consider the suggestion of the hon. Member."

Repairs to the river channel in Mal-Mimal village, Wallaja taluk.

* 100 *Q.*—Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the river channel in Mal-Mimal village of the Wallaja taluk is in a neglected condition and whether it is a fact that on this ground remissions are being granted even during the first crop;

(*b*) when repairs were last executed to this channel; and

(*c*) whether it is a fact that the Deputy Collector had recommended the construction of an aqueduct, and if so, the reason why this proposal has been given up?

A.—(*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) The Government have not the information but have called for a report.

Irrigation Board for Nandyal tanks.

* 101 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether and, if so, when an Irrigation Board was sanctioned for the distribution and control of water from the tanks in Nandyal; and

(*b*) the rules relating to its constitution and functions?

A.—(*a*) An Irrigation Board was first formed by the Collector in 1916.

(*b*) The rules[a] for the working of the Board are appended.

Minor Irrigation

Grievances of the ryots under the Cumbum tank, Kurnool district.

* 102 *Q.*—S. M. K. BEYABANI SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(i) whether there is any proposal before the Government to consider the grievances of the ryots under Cumbum tank (Kurnool) which has been drying up almost every year for the past 30 years; and

(ii) whether the Government have under consideration the question of investigating a suitable project for the above tank?

A.—(i) No.

(ii) No.

---

[a] Printed as Appendix II on page 330 infra.

4th August 1932]

S. M. K. BEYABANI SAHIB Bahadur:—"May I ask whether the Government are aware that the tank has been drying up almost every year for the past 30 years?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"The Government are aware that in recent years 95 per cent of the irrigable ayacut has received water for irrigation of the first crop every year."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask whether the Government have any proposal to remodel the irrigation channel of the Cumbum tank?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"The Chief Engineer has reported that owing to the failure to do kudimaramath work, channels have become very much silted up and the flow is obstructed by weeds and moss. He has asked the Collector to see that these defects are remedied. He has also found that there are a great many sluices without shutters and locks. He has called for estimates for providing these with shutters and locks so as to prevent waste of water."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"With regard to the information that 95 per cent of the ayacut has been irrigated, may I ask the Government to state whether it refers to the first crop alone or first and second crop together?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"It refers to first crop only."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Are they entered in the accounts as single crop or double crop?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"I think as single crop."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask the hon. Member to look at the irrigation figures once again, because I am afraid his figure of 95 per cent is altogether wrong?"

Land Revenue Administration

Service inams.

* 103 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government, the Inam Commissioner or the Collectors of the districts maintain any lists of religious and charitable service inams confirmed by the Commissioner in or about 1860, with the terms and conditions on which they have been confirmed; and

(*b*) whether a list of these religious and charitable service inams in the districts of South Arcot and Salem is available and whether copies of the same will be placed on the table of the House?

A.—(*a*) The Inam Commissioner and the Collectors maintain such lists.

(*b*) The Government are enquiring how many such inams there are in these two districts and what would be the cost of printing the lists of them. The question of placing copies of the lists on the table of the House will be considered when a reply is received.

[4th August 1932

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" Will the hon. the Revenue Member call for information from the Collectors as to the original extent of the grants and the present extent of the grants and the nature of their administration at present?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I will consider the hon. Member's suggestion."

Rendition of Sivaganga.

* 104 *Q*.—Swami A. S. SAHAJANANDAM: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Estate of Sivaganga is in a progressive condition without debts under the management of the present Estate Collector representing the Court of Wards; and

(*b*) whether the Government will be pleased to state the probable time of rendition of Sivaganga Estate from the management of the Court of Wards to the Raja of Sivaganga?

A.—(*a*) The hon. Member's attention is invited to the Annual Administration reports of the Court of Wards which have been published.

(*b*) It is not at present possible to say.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I ask whether the estate of Sivaganga is still indebted?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I think it is just out of debt at present."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I ask why the estate should still continue under the Court of Wards?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" Because the conditions under which it was taken over still continue."

Alleged delay in the disposal of business by the Tahsildar, Mangalore.

* 105 *Q*.—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether the Tahsildar and Head Accountant of the Mangalore Taluk office and the staff of the same, unnecessarily ill-treat and inordinately delay the work of respectable landlords that happen to go on business to the taluk office?

A.—The Government have not the information. They have received no complaints of any such conduct.

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—" May I ask the Government if after they received this interpellation from a responsible member of this Council, they called for information and ascertained whether the allegations made therein are true or not?"

4th August 1932]

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" It is very difficult to call for a report on such vague statements as this. If any particular instances are brought to the notice of the Government they will have the matter enquired into by the Collector."

Landlord and Tenants

Collection of 'kattalai' by the Zamindar of Udaiyarpalaiyam.

* 106 *Q*.—Mr. V. T. ARASU : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether the Zamindar of Udaiyarpalaiyam has been permitted by the Government to collect 'kattalai' (collection fees) by means of any special order?

A.—No.

Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" May I ask whether it is legal for a zamindar to collect any kattalai fees? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" That is a matter for the Court to decide."

Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" May I ask whether it is a fact that in 1912 Government issued a specific order to the zamindars that they should not collect kattalai fees? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" I should like notice of the question."

Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" May I ask whether the Government are aware of the fact that courts have decided that the collection of kattalai fees is illegal and that the zamindars should not collect them? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" I am not at present acquainted with this fact."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" May I know whether the Government will issue orders preventing the collection of these kattalai fees? " 11 a

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" This is a matter which should be decided by the Courts, as I have already stated."

Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" Will the hon. Member be pleased to state whether he is aware that kattalai fees are being collected by the Zamindar of Udaiyarpalaiyam? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" I am not aware of it."

Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" May I ask whether the Government will make enquiries and if they find that these fees are collected, will they direct the Udaiyarpalaiyam Zamindar to stop this collection? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" No, Sir. The Estates Land Act deals with the matter."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" Will the hon. the Member be pleased to state whether the Government will give Police aid for the collection of these fees? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" The matter is regulated by the provisions of the Madras Estates Land Act."

[4th August 193?

Territorial Changes

Proposal for the amalgamation of the North Arcot and Chittoor districts.

* 107 *Q.*—Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether any proposal is under consideration regarding the amalgamation of the North Arcot district and Chittoor district; and if so, the nature of the proposal; and

(*b*) in what stage the above proposal is?

A.—(*a*) The possibility of abolishing the Chittoor district by restoring more or less the arrangements which existed before the district was formed is being examined.

(*b*) The Board of Revenue has reported its views, which are under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether the reports of the Collectors of the districts and of the Board of Revenue will be placed on the table of the House or supplied to Members interested in the matter?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"I shall consider the suggestion of the hon. Member."

Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar:—"May I ask what the views of the Board of Revenue are?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"I do not know; the report has just been received."

Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar:—"Is the hon. Member aware that the Chittoor district is predominantly a Telugu district, that North Arcot is a Tamil district and that the amalgamation of these two districts will lead to lot of difficulties?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative; the answer to the latter part is a matter of opinion."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I ask whether orders have been passed for the transfer of certain portions of the North Arcot district to South Arcot or whether the proposal is still under consideration?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"I am not aware of any such orders."

Local Self-Government

Finances of the Nandyal Municipality.

* 108 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state the amount of profit or loss at which the Nandyal Municipality has been working during each of the last four years, and if it has been working at a loss the measures taken to make the municipality limit its expenditure to the income?

4th August 1932]

A.—The subjoined statement shows the surplus or deficit and the closing balance of the Nandyal Municipal Council during each of the four years ending with 1931–32:—

Year.	General Fund (Ordinary). Surplus or deficit in ordinary revenue.	General Fund (Ordinary). Closing balance on 31st March.	Elementary Education Fund. Surplus or deficit.	Elementary Education Fund. Closing balance on 31st March.
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
1928–29 [1]	+ 10,065	+ 3,451	— 721	— 396
1929–30 [1]	+ 4,509	— 8,955	— 360	— 1,335 [3]
1930–31 [1]	— 6,348	— 20,482	— 471	— 1,806
1931–32 [2]	— 3,931	— 8,847	+ 1,906	+ 100

[1] Actuals.
[2] Revised estimate.
[3] Revised with reference to Provident Fund amount of teachers to be adjusted to the general fund.

Government have appointed a special officer to scrutinize the finances of local bodies. The special officer will shortly visit Kurnool district and will report on the finances of the Nandyal Municipal Council.

Religious and Charitable Endowments

Administration of the Kachankurichi temple.

* 109 *Q.*—B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Hindu Religious Endowments Board has ever considered the question of bringing under the Hindu Religious Endowments Act the administration of the temple of Kachankurichi, Kollengode, Palghat;

(*b*) what is the annual income of the temple and who are the trustees; and

(*c*) why the temple has not been taken over by the Board yet?

A.—(*a*) The temple in question has been under the jurisdiction of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board ever since the inception of the Board.

(*b*) The income assessed by the Board for purposes of levy of contribution in fasli 1341 is Rs. 20,734. The trustees of the temple are—

(1) Raja Sir V. Vasudeva Raja, *Kt.*, C.I.E., M.L.A.
(2) M.R.Ry. Cherukunnath Krishnan Nambudripad Avargal.
(3) M.R.Ry. Cherumpatta Vasudevan Nambudri Avargal.

(*c*) The Act does not provide for the assumption by the Board of the management of temples.

[4th August 1932

Education

Appointment of a retired gentleman as Secretary of the Board of Government Technical Examinations.

* 110 *Q.*—Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state what the reasons are for reappointing a retired gentleman to the post of the Secretary of the Government Technical Examinations and retaining him for such a long time?

A.—It is presumed that the hon. Member refers to the Secretary to the Commissioner for Government Examinations. The post of Secretary is a part-time and non-pensionable one with a small pay attached to it. Consequently it has been the practice to appoint retired officers to this post. The retention of the present incumbent is considered desirable as he is an officer of considerable experience and possesses a thorough knowledge of the details of the work of the office.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" May I know whether the hon. Minister is aware that the gentleman who is holding the office is very old, that he retired long ago and that it is a scandal that the hon. Minister should patronize officers who do not deserve to be patronized and who are not qualified for the post? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" The answer to that is an emphatic negative."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" Will the hon. Minister be pleased to let me know whether it is not necessary that there should be a permanent and whole-time officer holding this post instead of a part-time officer, in view of the importance of the post? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" I do not think it is necessary."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" May I ask whether the Government do not consider this post as a very important one? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" Yes; the duties of the post are carried on quite satisfactorily by a part-time officer."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" May I know whether the hon. Minister does not think that this post should be held by an honourable gentleman? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" The present incumbent is an honourable gentleman."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" Has the hon. Minister made any attempts to secure a person in the service of the Government to fill this post? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" A man in service would not take up a part-time post."

4th August 1932]

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan :—" May I know if the Government are of opinion that there is no other man who is prepared to take up this post and who would discharge the duties better than at present? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" The question will arise after the present incumbent ceases to hold the appointment."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan :—" How long will he continue? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" I cannot say."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar :—" What are the emoluments of the post? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" Notice, Sir."

Delay in filling up the Vice-Principalship of the Law College, Madras.

* 111 *Q.*—Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the vacancy in the Vice-Principalship of the Law College has been filled up; and

(*b*) if not, what the reason is for the delay?

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) The Madras Services Commission has been addressed to make a selection and has advertised the vacancy.

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan :—" May I ask whether this post should not go legitimately to persons who are holding the posts of Professors in the Law College at present? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" It is an office coming under the statutory rules; there is no such provision in those rules."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I know whether the Government will not consider the desirability of abolishing this post in view of retrenchment? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" We have already made retrenchments; I do not think any further retrenchment is possible."

Overdrawal of the fixed travelling allowance by the Inspecting Officers of the Educational Department.

* 112 *Q.*—Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether inspecting officers of the educational department have submitted memorials to Government regarding recovery of alleged overdrawn fixed travelling allowance;

(*b*) the circumstances under which such overdrawal was ordered;

(c) the period for which recoveries have been ordered; and

(d) the action taken by Government on such memorials?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Prior to 1926 the touring of Deputy Inspectors was regulated by the provisions of the Madras Inspection Code according to which—

(i) Deputy Inspectors had to tour for 190 days in a year subject to certain monthly minima; and

(ii) District Educational Officers could condone shortage in touring in the case of Deputy Inspectors who had a large number of schools in or about the headquarters.

In 1926 a general revision of the travelling allowance rules took place. According to these rules Deputy Inspectors continued to have to tour for 190 days in a year but there was no minimum touring for any month and a journey could not be reckoned as a journey on tour if it did not reach a point outside a radius of more than five miles from headquarters. The rules further provided that if an officer did not tour for the prescribed number of days, his fixed travelling allowance should be reduced for each day in deficit by an amount equal to a day's travelling allowance. These rules were communicated by the Director of Public Instruction to subordinate officers on the 4th September 1926 and in a proceedings issued by the Government on the 2nd September 1927 and communicated by the Director of Public Instruction to subordinate officers on the 12th September 1927, it was definitely stated that the provisions in the Madras Inspection Code in regard to touring had been superseded by the new travelling allowance rules. The officers nevertheless continued to draw travelling allowance according to the provisions of the Madras Inspection Code and, as a result, some of them drew travelling allowance in excess of what they were eligible for according to the new rules. On a representation from the Director of Public Instruction, the recovery of overpayments up to end of 1927 was waived by the Government: and it was ordered that there was no justification for a further relaxation of the rules. The overdrawals were thus the result of officers having ignored definite instructions from the Government and the Director of Public Instruction.

(c) The Director of Public Instruction has ordered recoveries of overdrawals for the period from 1st January 1928 to 31st August 1931.

(*d*) No orders have been passed on the memorials.

4th August 1932]

Compilation of a text book on hygiene for use in schools in the Presidency.

* 113 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have made enquiries that in the Bengal Presidency a text book in hygiene called "Swastya Raksha" compiled by an Ayurvedic physician has been prescribed for use in schools by the provincial Government with the approval of their Director of Public Instruction; and

(*b*) whether any competent person in this Presidency has prepared or has been asked by the Government to prepare a text book of that type for use in the Government and aided schools of this Presidency?

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) There is no information about the book 'Swastya Rakhsa'; but books on hygiene prepared by competent persons have been approved by the Text Book Committee for use in schools.

Prescription of a book on health for use in schools.

* 114 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have prescribed any book or books dealing with health to be taught in the middle or the high schools; and

(*b*) whether the Government have arranged or are arranging for the publication of such books by competent medical men?

A.—(*a*) Government do not prescribe text-books for middle or high schools.

(*b*) No; but Government understand that several books dealing with health suitable for use in schools are published by private firms and have been approved by the Text Book Committee.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS

Forest Panchayats

Forest panchayats in North Arcot district.

115 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. RANGASWAMI REDDI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of forest panchayats constituted in the North Arcot district;

(*b*) whether there is any Government Order specifying that half the amount of fine and compensation collected by the forest panchayats should be given to the concerned panchayats for their improvements;

(*c*) whether any circular was issued by the Government to give effect to the order;

(*d*) whether the order so issued was subsequently held in abeyance, if so, for what reasons;

[4th August 1932

(e) whether it is a fact that the Government are enforcing the forest panchayats to pay annually half the amount, and in many cases the full amount of moiety of compensation and fine collected in addition to the lease fixed in accordance with the provisions of the agreement entered into by the Secretary of State and the panchayatdars;

(f) whether it is a fact that panchayatdars are forced to pay the fine and compensation amount without consulting the panchayats and acting on their views; and

(g) whether it is a fact that by the enforcement of this taxation most of the panchayats are unwilling to work?

A.—(a) Ninety.

(b) & (c) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to G.O. No. 1541, Revenue, dated 11th August 1930, which has been placed at the disposal of the press.

(d) In January 1932, the Government ordered as a measure of retrenchment that the payment of the amount should be stopped until the rent payable to Government by each panchayat had been revised after taking into account its estimated receipts on account of such payment.

(e) The Government are not aware that the facts are as suggested, but are enquiring.

(f) The Government do not understand the question.

(g) The Government are not aware that this is so.

Forest panchayats in North Arcot district working on a deficit balance.

116 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government will be pleased to call for a list of forest panchayats in the North Arcot district working on a minus balance;

(b) whether the Government are willing to encourage such panchayats by way of granting remission in lease amount whenever there is a fall of income;

(c) whether any order was issued to enhance the lease amount by the full amount of moiety of compounding fees in the case of panchayats which are working satisfactorily;

(d) whether it is a fact that in respect of certain panchayats in the North Arcot district the Collector has directed that the lease amount should be enhanced by the full amount of moiety;

(e) if so, what they are; what the benefit derived is by the panchayats by such enhancement by the full amount; and

(f) whether it is a fact that moiety of compounding fees has not been paid to many of the panchayats for over three years in the North Arcot district?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government do not understand what the hon. Member means by panchayats working on a minus balance. His attention is invited to the Standing Orders on Forest Panchayats (which have been published). These give the policy of the Government in regard to such panchayats and the principles adopted in fixing the lease amounts. If any panchayat needs financial assistance it can make a representation to the Collector and the Board of Revenue.

(*c*) The answer is in the negative.

(*d*) & (*e*) The Government have not the information.

(*f*) The Government are not aware that the fact is as suggested. The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clauses (*b*), (*c*) and (*d*) of question Nos. 115, 177.

Irrigation

High level channel for irrigating the Murungapettai area.

117 *Q.*—Rao Bahadur T. M. NARAYANASWAMI PILLAI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have sanctioned the utilization of water from the high level channel for irrigating the sanded fields in the Murungapettai area, Trichinopoly district; and

(*b*) whether it has been put into execution; if not, why not?

A.—(*a*) The Government approved, in March 1931, an estimate amounting to Rs. 73,000 for the excavation of the Puduvaithalai High Level Channel for the irrigation of the sanded areas of the Murungapettai block in the Trichinopoly district and made provision for it in the Budget Estimate for 1931-32.

(*b*) The scheme has been postponed on account of the present financial stringency.

Flood discharge in the Pennar bridge.

118 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. RANGASWAMI REDDI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state the maximum flood discharge in Pennar bridge on road No. 14 for the past ten years?

A.—The Government have not the information, but have called for a report.

The Tungabhadra Project.

119 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) at what stage the Tungabhadra Project stands;

(*b*) at what stage the negotiations with the Nizam's Government stand;

[4th August 1932

(c) whether it is a fact that nearly a decade ago a note was received from the then Chief Engineer of Irrigation of Nizam's Government that if both the Nizam and Madras Government agree the Tungabhadra Project could be successfully carried out to the advantage of the famine stricken zones in both territories;

(d) whether that note suggested the construction of a storage reservoir at Hoonoor mutty;

(e) whether that note mentioned that the charge per commanded acre would not exceed Rs. 9;

(f) whether the Nawab expressly mentioned that to utilize the great gift of nature, the Tungabhadra river, to the best advantage, the following works should be started:

(i) a storage reservoir of sufficient power at Hoonoor mutty;

(ii) Bellary Project on the British side eventually tailing into the Kurnool-Cuddapah canal but not contemplating any large supplementing of waters of Pennar for irrigation in Nellore district;

(iii) utilization of the fall that cannot be conveniently taken advantage of for irrigation purposes towards the development of power which is another way of protecting the country from famine;

(iv) necessary enlargement and extension of Cuddapah-Kurnool canal for the requirements of the tract which can be brought under command; and

(g) why the project is being delayed?

A.—(*a*) It is under correspondence with the Bombay, Mysore and Hyderabad Governments.

(*b*) The Hyderabad Government have not given their final reply to a reference from this Government in regard to the utilization of the Tungabhadra waters and their participation in the project.

(*c*) *to* (*f*) No such note can be traced in the records of the Madras Government.

(*g*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clauses (*a*) and (*b*).

Territorial Changes

Proposal, if any, for the transfer of certain taluks from North Arcot district to South Arcot district.

120 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether there is any proposal to exclude any of the taluks from the present North Arcot district and add them to South Arcot;

(*b*) if so, what they are;

(*c*) whether there is any proposal before the Government to add Tiruvannamalai and Chengam taluks now attached to the North Arcot district to South Arcot;

(*d*) whether the Collectors of Salem, Chittoor and North and South Arcot districts have been consulted in the matter and if so, what the opinions offered by them are;

4th August 1932]

(*e*) whether the Government are aware of the fact that Kangundi Kuppam Zamindari area which was once attached to the North Arcot district has been added to the Chittoor district on the representation of the Zamindar of Kangundi Kuppam; and

(*f*) whether Kangundi was added to the Telugu district—Chittoor, as it was a Telugu-speaking estate?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*c*) The Board of Revenue has been asked to examine the possibility of abolishing the Chittoor district. A tentative suggestion has been made to transfer the Tiruvannamalai and Chengam taluks from the North Arcot to the South Arcot district.

(*d*) The Collectors of the districts concerned have been consulted. The Board's report on the subject has just been received.

(*e*) A major portion of the zamindari was transferred from the North Arcot to the Chittoor district. The zamindar was in favour of the change.

(*f*) Yes.

[*Note.*—**An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.**]

II.—ACT ASSENTED TO BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I have to announce that the Madras Cotton Control Act of 1932 received the assent of His Excellency the Governor-General on the 17th June 1932."

III.—THE ORISSA COMMITTEE REPORT.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" The House will now resume the discussion on the amendment of the Raja of Bobbili. Mr. Patnaik will continue his speech."

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—" Sir, I was dealing with the historical aspect of the question. I was referring to paragraphs 54 and 55 of the Committee's Report at page 20. It is as follows:—

'It is believed that the Lion dynasty which from about A.D. 473 ruled Orissa for more than six centuries, extended its sway over the neighbouring tract of Ganjam. This dynasty was overthrown in the 12th century by Chonango Deo, the founder of the Gajapati line of kings. The domains of the Gajapati kings certainly extended beyond the river Kistna and their power was at its height in the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries. The wild nature of the country in Ganjam, however, rendered their administration merely nominal and it is probably for this reason that they established their servants as Lords of the Marches to keep in check the aboriginal tribes of Khonds and Savaras, who as late as the 18th century still occupied portions of the plains. Some of the present zamindars claim descent from the Gajapati kings, and the gazetteer of the district written in the seventies of the last century, states that the Rajas even at present still acknowledge the Raja of Jaggannath or Puri as their chief. Most of the zamindaris are still held by Oriya families.

'In 1560 the last of the independent kings of Orissa was defeated and slain by the Muhammadans, and from about 1571 Ganjam which formed part of the Chicacole Circar was controlled by them from Hyderabad. In 1753 it was assigned by the Subedar of the Deccan to the French.'

" From this it is clear that Ganjam was an integral part of the Province of Orissa for a very long time. It was only when there was

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo] [4th August 1932

disruption of Ganjam from Orissa, this part was taken over by the Nizam, until eventually the British took possession of it. I may say that, before the British began to rule, every Government was merely nominal. The Central Government merely cared for the tribute to be paid by the vassals and the Chiefs. But the entire management or the administration both civil, criminal and revenue was left to certain Chiefs. The Central Government became powerful only under the British rule. Oriya kings appointed their servants or relatives as Chieftains.

" So far as the Telugus are concerned, I read out an extract from the fifth report the other day. It is clear from that report that the two leading Zamindars of the Northern Circars—the Bobbili family and the Vizianagram family—came to the Circars only in the 17th century as officials of the Nawab, and gradually acquired large tracts of land which were subsequently permanently settled as their estates.

" Let me go into the question of the division. I have already indicated the portion proposed to be transferred to the new Province. According to the report, the portions are: the whole of Balliguda division, the whole of the Gumsur division, a large portion of the Berhampur taluk, the whole of the Jeypore division, and a small portion of the Chicacole division. At the outset it will be useful to show that so far as the Ganjam district is concerned, it consists of five divisions: (1) Ballignda division—that is, the purely Agency tract which consists of three taluks; in that division, Oriya is the sole language spoken. The Telugu population there is very negligible. The Khonds and the Savaras who inhabit the division along with the Oriyas are taught only Oriya in schools and they have got no written language. An attempt is being made by Rao Sahib Ramamurti Pantulu to teach the Savaras Roman characters. The attempt is bound to fail. Nobody wants now that a new language should be added to the numerous languages of this country. These people must learn only recognized languages. At present, public opinion goes to the length of saying that even the recognized languages should go and that only a single language should be adopted as the language for the whole of India. Therefore, nobody should make an attempt to add to the existing languages. Still that gentleman, Rao Sahib Ramamurti Pantulu, wants his new invention to be recognized. He is the chief opponent to the transfer of Parlakimedi. The Savaras have their kith and kin on either side of the border, that is, the middle of Orissa. A large portion of these people reside there and we have got figures given here.

Khonds in Orissa	287,255
Khonds in Madras	329,569
Savaras in Orissa	202,635
Savaras in Madras	210,511

" In G.O. No. 103, Public, the Madras Government have given the respective strength of the people on the above basis.

" From this it is clear that these Savaras have their kith and kin in Orissa, and it is but right that they should be placed under one

4th August 1932] [Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo]

administration. So far as the Oriyas are concerned, what they want is that all these people should be placed under one administration; and I do not think the Madras Government is going to get a transfer of that portion from Orissa. Even the Andhras, at the enquiry held at Gopalpur and at Waltair, did not lay claim to the Balliguda division at all. In the memorandum submitted by the Andhras to the Joint Select Committee in 1919, in Annexure II, they say 'Orissa including Oriya tracts of the Ganjam and Vizagapatam districts of the Madras Presidency, language Oriya,' etc. In 1919, the Andhras admitted the claim of the Oriyas. They have clearly stated that a portion of the Vizagapatam district should go. If this resolution is to be adopted, what is the portion that was thought of in 1919? Will the hon. the Raja Sahib of Bobbili point out if this resolution is not inconsistent with the memorandum submitted by the leaders of the Andhra people in 1919? If, however, better light has dawned on the Andhras during this period, I have nothing more to say.

"Let us now take up the Gumsur division. This division consists practically of three taluks. The Gumsur taluk is purely a Government area; it was also a zamindari until 1835 when it was bought by the Government and converted into a ryotwari tract. Surada was also a zamindari, a sub-taluk of the Aska taluk. That was also bought by the Zamindar of Gumsur, and when Gumsur itself was bought by the Government, this was also bought. My friend asks me 'what about Kodala taluk?' It is in the Chatrapur division. It belongs to the Raja of Khallikote. If the Raja Sahib of Khallikote had not been here, that also would have been claimed. But one thing: the Raja Sahib of Bobbili has been very generous in not claiming that the portions which belong to him should go to the Andhra province. He has only taken the Rushikulya river as the boundary. The Aska taluk comprises Surada, a Government area, the Dharakoti Estate, the Sharaga Estate and the other estates round about Aska. The line proposed by the Raja Sahib of Bobbili cuts up the Sanokimedi Estate into two. The Ghodahado river cuts up this area. If you look at page 21 of the Report, you will find that the total population of the Sanokimedi Estate is 58,769, of which 45,718 are Oriyas and 6,887 are Telugus. You will therefore see that there is a large Oriya population here. The whole of the Gumsur division should go into Orissa; Government also recognized Oriya as the sole Court language in the Gumsur division, so long ago as 1913. I do not think the Madras Government will now say that the Government Order then passed was incorrect and that we should now go back upon it. That being so, I think the Raja Sahib of Bobbili will have to give up his claim at least so far as the Gnmsur division is concerned.

"Then with regard to the Berhampur division, the influence of the people there is very great. People there are most active against their inclusion in the new province. You have got there a gentleman by name Rao Sahib Nettan Ramamurti Nayudu. He was a gentleman of the Godavari district; but he married into an official family

in Berhampur taluk and then became a Huzur Sarishtadar in the Ganjam district. That gentleman was the person who really drafted the report of the Government of Madras in 1904, opposing the transfer of any portion of Ganjam. That gentleman, of course, is now the leader of the Anti-Amalgamation Committee organized by the Andhras in Ganjam. You don't find any people living in the mufassal taking any interest in the matter. So far as the Berhampur town itself is concerned, the Telugu population is 47 or 48 per cent. Apart from the town of Berhampur, the Berhampur division consists of what was formerly the estate of Mohiri which was bought by the Government in 1835. Then we have also two bits of land on the coast which are Government areas tacked on to the Berhampur taluk; but for purposes of criminal jurisdiction, they are included in the Ichchapur sub-magistracy and the Sompet sub-magistracy. With regard to these two taluks, the Deputy Tahsildars of Ichchapur and Sompet are independent, so far as the estate areas are concerned. But with regard to the Government area included in these two taluks, the Deputy Tahsildars are subordinate to the Tahsildar of Berhampur. In the Government area of Berhampur taluk is included the Bodokimedi or the Peddakimedi Estate. Let us now look into the population of these areas. If we take the Berhampur taluk as a unit, then what are the parts that would comprise it? First, there is the Mohiri Estate bought by the Government, the Bodokimedi Estate, the Government area in the Ichchapur taluk and the Government area in the Sompet taluk. The Berhampur taluk is divided into two parts in the report, Berhampur A and Berhampur B. So far as the Bodokimedi Estate is concerned, the total population is 64,220 of which the Oriyas number 45,552 while the Telugus come to about 10,000. Therefore, I am afraid the hon. the Raja Sahib of Bobbili must admit that Bodokimedi also should go into Orissa.
5 So, Sir, I may take it that the hon. the Raja Sahib of Bobbili is willing to admit the claim of the Oriyas to the whole of the Berhampur taluk if it shows a preponderatingly high percentage of Oriya population. Shall I throw it as a challenge and if he accepts that challenge, then there is an end of the matter. The total population of the Berhampur taluk is given as 241,000, of which the Oriyas contribute 129,000, the Telugus 105,000 and the others 6,500. Therefore, it is clear from this that the Oriya population is more than 50 per cent and is the preponderating population in that taluk. I hope the Raja Sahib of Bobbili will have no objection to the inclusion of Berhampur taluk in the new province, as also the Government areas in the coast which were formerly included in the Ichchapur and Sompet taluk." (Interruptions.)

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member should proceed with his speech seriously and not allow himself to be interrupted very often by the other Members of the House. I am afraid, the House will get impatient if he goes on answering aside, questions like that. I, therefore, advise him to go on with his speech without giving room for interruption and unmindful of interruptions. If he wants to be uninterrupted, he may occupy a seat near the Chair and speak."

4th August 1932]

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"They can interrupt me from any quarter. Then, Sir, so far as Berhampur B is concerned, it has been excluded by the Committee from the area to be transferred to the new province. We agree with the hon. the Raja Sahib of Bobbili that a taluk should be taken as a unit and if that test is applied, Berhampur B also should be included in the new province. If we agree to this principle, I believe, the Raja Sahib will not fail to give effect to his own principle that the taluk should be taken as a unit. If you take the Berhampur B bit, then the Telugu population in the other parts of the Berhampur taluk will be considerably reduced in spite of the fact that there is a very large population in the town itself. It may be taken that the Bodokimedi Estate is south of the Ghodado river and if this resolution is adopted, then it will leave out Bodokimedi also, as well as the whole of the Berhampur taluk.

"Then, Sir, as regards the Chatrapur taluk, the Rushikulya river cuts this taluk into two parts. (An hon. Member: Is it Rasagulla?) No, it is not Rasagulla, but Rushikulya and it means the canal dug by a Rishi. So far as Chatrapur division is concerned, the total population is 187,000, of which the Oriyas form 139,500 and the Telugus only 38,000. So, applying the same test of the Raja Sahib of Bobbili, the whole of Chatrapur also should go into the new province. Then the Rushikulya river should not be taken as the boundary. The Ichchapur taluk comprises three estates, namely, Surangi, Jalantra and the main block of Chukati Estate and in these estates the total population is 80,000, of which the Oriyas form 50,000 and the Telugus only 23,000 in all the three estates. Therefore, the Committee has thought it right to include these three estates in the new province.

"Then, we have got the Sompet taluk which consists of two parts. These two parts do not include the Government area that is administered by the Deputy Tahsildar of Sompet subject to the control of the Tahsildar of Berhampur only so far as the Government area is concerned. The estates are Jalantra, Mandasa, Budarsingi a portion of Chikati Estate and Baruva. These are the areas comprised in the A and B areas. In the A *portion Oriyas predominate and in the* B portion the Telugus predominate and therefore, the A portion at all events should have been included in the new province. From a look at the map, it will be seen that Surangi and Bodokimedi are contiguous. The Budarsingi Estate is a small estate adjoining the Parlakimedi Estate and it is quite possible that the Sompet A does not include merely the Budarsingi Estate but also certain portions of the Jalantra and Mandasa Estates. It is not possible to say what it comprises, but there is the Oriya belt and that Oriya belt at all events ought to be transferred to the new province. In the report they give no reasons why this should not go to the new province, even though the Oriya population there is 75 per cent of the whole population.

"In the Berhampur taluk, the Oriya population alone is about 54 per cent, whereas the Telugu population is only 43 per cent. ; Of

course, some people are shown under other languages. They are people who speak some corrupt form of Oriya; probably they were the *aboriginees, that is, the Khonds who have cast off their language* and taken Oriya as their language. Again, in the Ichchapur taluk, the percentage of the Oriya population is 65 and of the Telugus 32.

"If we go to the Chicacole division in the Parlakimedi taluk, there are the Narasannapet sub-taluk and Tekkali sub-taluk. Now, Mandasa may not be taken into consideration as it will introduce complications, because from the 1st of July Ichchapur taluk has been abolished and the estate portion of Ichchapur taluk has been transferred to the Sompet taluk and Mandasa has to go into the Chicacole sub-division. In that case, the whole of Sompet can be claimed for *the new province on the basis of population.* Now, Chicacole consists of Chicacole, Tekkali and Parlakimedi taluks. Parlakimedi consists of the estate of Parlakimedi and the village of Hiramandalam belonging to the Raja of Vizianagram and also the Parlakimedi Malliyas. So far as the Hiramandalam village is concerned, that should be excluded and there is no reason why that should go into the new province. Then we have got the estate of Parlakimedi and the Parlakimedi Malliyas. So far as the Malliyas are concerned, out of a total population of *69,000,* the Oriyas are 15,000, the Telugus 1,000 and the rest are aboriginal tribes and all these aboriginal tribes have adopted Oriya as their language. They have been taught in the Oriya language for a very long time, and they are connected with Parlakimedi. It was only in the year 1802 when the Parlakimedi Estate came under Permanent Settlement, this portion was taken away from the permanently settled estate. When the Agency tracts were held by certain Zamindars on feudal service tenure, such Sanad was not granted to the Raja of Parlakimedi though it was for nearly a century treated as part of the zamindari *and large sums of the zamindari were spent by the Court of Wards* on the improvement of the Parlakimedi Malliyas. On the Raja instituting a suit in the Court of the Agent, the matter went up to the High Court and the High Court decided against the Raja and ultimately it went up to the Privy Council who confirmed the decision of the High Court. So, the Raja lost the Agency tract Malliyas. The suit ended only in 1904 and the decision of the Privy Council is reported in the I.L.R.

"All these I have said to show that the Parlakimedi Malliyas are historically connected with the Parlakimedi estate from a very long time. In the Parlakimedi estate as many as seven thousand Oriyas are shown as speaking Telugu. For this the Government is to be blamed to some extent. For, for a very long time, the Oriya tongue was not recognized as *the Court language. The Court language* was Telugu only. It was only in 1890 the Oriyà language was recognized as the Court language. And this was done by G.O. No. 2024, Judicial, dated 16th December 1890, for the first time. The reason for this is not far to seek. The Parlakimedi Estate was under the Court of Wards from the beginning of the 19th century until 1890, and then again from 1905 till 1913. The estate is a small tract of land and so the

4th August 1932] [Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo]

people of the locality themselves were appointed to act as Court of Wards, until in 1930 the Government considered that for efficient administration the people from the south should be appointed to manage the estate. And so these people from the south were taken as managers, and they naturally took with them their language and also some of their men. In this way they introduced the Telugu language in that part. Even then they found it necessary to have an Oriya Sarishtadar in addition to a Telugu Sarishtadar during the transition period. This was about 1850, and till 1890 Telugu continued to be the Court language, so much so, the grandson of an Oriya poet had to study Telugu to be appointed karnam of his village to the neglect of his mother tongue. It was in this way that we lost our Oriya tongue. Hence you see in the statistics that while there are 67,000 Oriyas on the basis of race test, there are 60,000 people speaking Oriya. And this is accounted for by the fact that a great number of Oriyas had to learn Telugu. After the establishment of the Parlakimedi College Oriya is taught there along with Telugu. But for that, the Oriyas of Parlakimedi would have completely lost the Oriya tongue. Under these circumstances, if there is a small percentage of Telugus over and above the number of Oriyas in that place, that should not go against the claim of the Oriyas. As I have said before, that is why I say in these Agency Tracts and in the Parlakimedi Estate the Malliyas should be taken as Oriya tracts. If that is done, you will find the Oriyas predominating in population. The aboriginal tribes should be taken as Oriyas only, for they are speaking Oriya language and Government are also teaching them that tongue only. The Savaras have got their kith and kin in Orissa; and therefore it is but proper and just that all the aboriginal tribes should be treated as Oriyas.

"There are other reasons also for my contention. Now who are the people who constitute the so-called Telugu population of Parlakimedi? They mainly consist of Kappus and Kalingis. They were the original inhabitants of the Ganjam district, known as Kalinga, the people who inhabited the Kalinga country, which consisted of the whole of the modern Ganjam district, the whole of Orissa and a portion of Vizagapatam. Hence we see people calling themselves Oriya Kappus and Oriya Kalingas. These people also inhabit the Berhampur taluk, Ichchapur, Sompet and Tekkali; and so I submit these tracts should go to the new province.

"There is another reason which ought to weigh with the Government. For the administration of the Agency tracts some non-agency area is always required. Balliguda is administered from the headquarters at Russellkonda and Parlakimedi town is the headquarters directly connected with the administration of Parlakimedi Maliyas. It is not possible for the officers to reside in the Agency areas which are generally unhealthy. Therefore, Parlakimedi town, which is at the foot of the Agency tract should serve as a basis of administration.

"Besides that, Parlakimedi Maliyas adjoin also a portion of the Jeypore Estate on its northern side; the railway line now connects

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo] [4th August 1932

Gumapur with Parlakimedi, and naturally the officers would wish to go by that route to Gumapur. Gumapur taluk touches also a portion of the Parlakimedi Estate and also a portion of the Balliguda division. For all these reasons I submit Government should not go against the recommendation of the Committee to include Parlakimedi in the new province.

" Now the prejudice of several people against the inclusion of Parlakimedi was created, so to speak, by the remarks of the majority of the members of the Committee. They have given grounds too personal to the Raja; and that has prejudiced several people in regard to inclusion of Parlakimedi in the new province. But what they simply meant was that the Raja was impartial. He has opened a college for both Telugus and Oriyas. He has started girls' schools, one for Oriyas and the other for Telugus. He has built choultries where Telugu Brahmans are fed; he has erected temples where Oriyas are fed; and I submit that these institutions should not be lost to the new province. Probably this is what the majority of the Committee mean; but the way in which that is put is revolting to several people, and hence I think many people are against the inclusion of Parlakimedi in the new province rather than on the merits of the case.

" Further it is clear from the map supplied that a certain portion of Parlakimedi is thickly populated by Oriyas, while the northern portion and the southern portion are peopled by Telugus. If you want to have the whole thing, as it were, weighed in golden scales, you can cut up Parlakimedi Estate into two, one where the Oriyas predominate and the other where the Telugus predominate.

"Well, I think in a matter like this, where the Oriya and the Telugu ryots of the Parlakimedi Estate have been connected with Parlakimedi for centuries, as was stated by Sir A. P. Patro, who has been associated with Oriya zamins and ryots for a very long time, there is no reason why simply because a small percentage of Telugus reside in the estate it should be cut up into two. I think the best thing to do under the circumstances is to go into the merits of the case rather than be blinded by the observations of the majority of the Committee. One reason given by the Chairman of the Committee is a large number of Telugus, who gave evidence, were in favour of going over to the new province. But it is suggested they had been coerced to do so, since they were the ryots of the zamindar. Naturally the presumption is one of undue influnce. Hence it is argued that the evidence of those people should not be considered to possess any value. I grant such a presumption; then what is it that we ought to do? Have we to proceed only on presumption? Certainly not. Of course, they are Telugus by birth.

" They won't naturally agree to the transfer of this portion to Orissa. Of course there is some force in that. But taking into consideration the class to which these people belong and the treatment which they get from the Raja the presumption of the Chairman is not correct. For a correct appreciation of the evidence the House should have

4th August 1932] [Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo]

the depositions given by the people. Unfortunately they are not available and the presumption after all is very weak. Those people have been connected with the Raja for a very long time. They pay very little rent. They get special advantages from the Raja. There is no need absolutely why they should think of going into the Andhra country and splitting up the Parlakimedi Estate into two.

"Now I shall deal with the Jeypore Agency. So far as the Agency of Jeypore is concerned it forms part of the Agency division constituted in 1920 by Government and it consists of six subdivisions: (1) the Khond subdivision consisting of Balliguda, G. Udayagiri and R. Udayagiri taluks; (2) the Savara subdivision consisting of Gunupur, Rayaghada and Bissamkatack taluks; (3) the Oriya subdivision with Koraput, Jeypore, Nowrangapur and Malkanagiri taluks; (4) the Ghats subdivision consisting of Pottanghi and Padwa taluks; (5) the Rampa subdivision consisting of Polavaram, Yellavaram, Chodavaram and Gudem taluks; (6) the Koya subdivision with Bhadrachalam and Nugur taluks. The last two subdivisions we do not want. That is not given to us. Those portions have been taken away altogether. The other four subdivisions have a preponderance of the Oriya population. The other two subdivisions are inhabited by Telugus or people under Telugu influence. At Waltair witnesses were examined and the Andhras did not put up any opposition at all. It will not be proper for me to give the names. Only a few witnesses were examined. Prabala Lakshmi Narasimham Pantulu who is the lawyer to the estates of Bobbili and Vizianagram as well as to Jeypore was also examined. So far as Jeypore was concerned the opposition of the late Maharaja has now disappeared. One stock argument advanced by the Government of Madras as well as the Andhras is that the river Godavari has certain tributaries flowing through Jeypore Estate and if the Jeypore Estate is transferred to Orissa the people of the Jeypore Estate will cut away all the trees by which the tributary passes so that the Godavari district will be cut off from the supply of water from the tributary. Of course this is an extraordinary argument invented by somebody and passed on by Government even to Parliament. This argument is a very extraordinary one. In the first instance no one will think of cutting down valuable forests of timber. Supposing that country is very fertile and can be converted into wet fields, it would have been so converted long ago. So the ordinary presumption is that that tract cannot be converted into wet fields. Nobody will be a fool to go and cut all the trees just to spite the ryots of the Godavari delta. Another thing is supposing the present owner wants to cut down forests. I wish to know if there is any law by which he could be prevented from doing so. If any law can be passed, it can be passed there also. Moreover Godavari takes its rise in Bombay Presidency and certain tributaries of it are in Jeypore Estate and the Nizam's dominions. If that is so, there is no fear of those people interfering with the supply of water. Moreover this tributary does not take its rise from Jeypore. It takes its rise in Kalahandi State which is in Orissa. You will see from a reference to the map of the Vizagapatam

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo] [4th August 1932

district that there are two horns of the Jeypore Estate and from the middle of it the tributary takes its source in the Kalahandi State. *Therefore it is not at all a valid ground.*"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I wish the hon. Member finishes soon because there are other hon. Members of the Council who are anxious to speak upon the subject."

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo :—" So far as finance is concerned, it has been shown that there is a deficit of 34 or 35 lakhs. The Council has to see how this is caused. In the first instance the Madras Government stands to gain by the transfer of the Agency tracts a sum of about 18 lakhs. Really I do not understand what is meant by the portion of the resolution of the Raja of Bobbili which related to finance. Why should any contribution be required from the Madras Government by either the new Orissa Government or by the Government of India ? If the Government of India ask for any contribution, that is a matter between the Government of India and the Local Government. Here we find the Madras Government gains Rs. 17,84,000. The Bihar Government gains Rs. 3,16,000 because there are certain deficit areas like Khond Mahals. So these backward areas contribute *to a deficit of 21 lakhs. What is the position of these backward areas* if autonomous Government is given to the provinces ? That is a question which has been discussed in the Simon Report. They say that no Council would pay any attention to the development of these backward areas, because they will neither have the willingness nor the means to pay such attention. In that case they propose that the whole of the deficit for the administration of these backward areas *should come from the Central Government. If that is so, there is* absolutely no reason why the Government of India, if they think that it is absolutely necessary that the Orissa Province should be formed and that these backward areas should go into it, so that all those backward areas which are homogenous may be under one administration, should not contribute the whole of the 21 lakhs? At pages 109—112 of the Simon Report, Volume II, you find the matter discussed. If that is so the deficit against this province will be considerably reduced. I do not see why the Andhras should oppose the transfer of these parts to Orissa. They are aware of the Report of the Simon Commission and they want subsequently to take advantage of the arrangements that will prevail for the administration of the backward areas and for their own purpose. I do not think that the aboriginal tribes would be benefited if they are either placed under the Madras Government or the Andhra Province. That of course is one item.

" The second item I would refer to is a sum of Rs. 8 lakhs, which is now paid by the Bihar Government to the Government of India as interest on account of what is known as the interest on the Orissa canal. That canal seems to have been constructed long ago, and the interest that has to be paid on the cost of its construction comes to Rs. 8 lakhs. The canal is of no use to the people. The Government

4th August 1932] [Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo]

gets no return from it, not even the charges of maintaining it, not to speak of the interest to be paid. All the same the amount is claimed by the Government of India. On this matter the Bihar Government applied to the Government of India for remission of the interest, and this they did on two occasions saying that the payment of interest was a great hardship. The Government of India do not seem to be entirely unfavourable towards this question. On page 61 of the Report, in paragraph 46, the matter is referred to thus:

'The Orissa Canals combining irrigation and navigation were designed and partly constructed by the East India Irrigation and Canal Company who entered into a contract with the Secretary of State in 1862, and surrendered it in 1868, while the works were still incomplete, on payment by the Government of India of the sum of £1,192,000. The works were completed from funds supplied by the Government of India at a total capital cost of Rs. 271·87 lakhs the interest charges on which now amount to Rs. 8·50 lakhs a year. The revenue from Irrigation and Navigation has never been sufficient to contribute anything towards the payment of interest charges and generally barely sufficient to cover the working expenses.

'The liability for the payment of the interest charges has fallen upon the Local Government since 1921–22, the year of Devolution, and when submitting a memorandum to the Statutory Commission in the year 1929, the Bihar and Orissa Government represented that this charge constituted a hardship from which it asked to be relieved. When submitting a copy of the report of the Orissa Flood Committee of 1928 they renewed this request and drew attention to the inability *of the Local Government to give effect to the more expensive recommendations of* the committee.'

"Thus, for some sin of somebody, the new province has to pay away Rs. $8\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs a year. When the Government of India entered into a contract for the construction of certain works which proved to be quite useless to the people of the district, I think the Government of India would not be justified in demanding a sum of Rs. 8 lakhs a year for ever from the people of the district. This sum of Rs. $8\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs ought to go from the demand against the new province. This matter was also brought to the notice of the Government of India, and in the Legislative Assembly the question came up on the 13th of March 1931, and with regard to that it was said that this question will be very sympathetically considered by the Finance Member. It was practically admitted to be a hardship and therefore the people ought to be relieved of this burden of payment of Rs. $8\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs.

"Then, we have got another sum of Rs. 2 lakhs the payment of which should also go. This is an item of interest payment with regard to certain irrigation works constructed in Ganjam. A canal was constructed long ago from Ganjam village to Gopalpur town. It is of no use, it is in ruins and it is not kept in repair. All the same on the money spent thereon, interest has to be paid. Probably the Local Government is paying the interest now. That interest is sought to be charged on the revenues of the new province. Then there is the Rushikulya project. Our contention is that so far as this project is concerned it is a protective work and not a remunerative work. There were famines in Ganjam, and to relieve the people from the hardships

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo] [4th August 1932

of the famines, that protective work was constructed, and therefore no interest should be charged upon the capital spent for the construction of the Rushikulya project. If we get a remission of this sum of two lakhs also, the whole of the remissions would come to Rs. 21 lakhs plus these $10\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs, or Rs. 31·50 lakhs, which will wipe off the deficit shown in the committee's report.

"There are several other points to be mentioned, but it is not possible for me to go into all those details. I shall refer only to certain major matters. Most of us here know the Saw Mill scheme in Russellkonda. The Government incurred very heavy loss in connexion with that scheme, and the whole loss the committee wants to debit to the new province. Is it right that for some blunder committed by the Government of Madras and sanctioned by the local Legislature, the whole burden of the loss should fall upon the portion of the Ganjam district proposed to be taken away? The scheme was not intended to benefit the people of the Ganjam district, which was chosen to be the place where the scheme was started. It was not at the request of the people that the work was undertaken. It was only a commercial project, so to speak, taken up by the Local Government. Such being the case, there is absolutely no reason why this loss should fall upon the Oriyas and upon the new province.

"Several of the hon. Members here say that the new province does not seem to be solvent, and therefore the whole scheme would fail. The new province is not at all insolvent as I showed it would not be a bankrupt province. It can pay its way as was held by the Simon Commission. Only we were not given an opportunity of scrutinizing the figures given by the committee. The Oriyas were not at all heard by the committee on the matter. Moreover, these figures do not take into consideration retrenchments made in every province. They took the figures as they were before the retrenchment.

"The next question is, so far as the Agency tracts are concerned, will it be beneficial to the Agency people to remain in Madras or rather in the new Andhradesa when that province is constituted, or to go into Orissa? One of the arguments advanced is that the Madras Government spends Rs. 4 per capita on Agency, whereas the Bihar and Orissa Government spends not even half that amount. Well, it may be a fact that the Madras Government spend so much. But, does every pie spent by the Madras Government go to the benefit of the Agency people? That is the question we have to consider. So far as the Agency is concerned, they want to open up the country and the roads are kept in order, so that motor buses and motor lorries can take away the Agency people to the Assam tea plantations. Is that benefiting the Agency people if large sums of money are spent on roads to carry away the people to work as coolies in the Assam plantations, while their own country, the Agency, is not developed by the money? In spite of the fact that the Agencies are sparsely populated, large

4th August 1932] [Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo]

numbers of people are being taken away from the Agency by emigration agencies which are working in the Agency. All the money is thus spent on road and not a single pie in opening an agricultural school or industrial school for the benefit of the poor people in the Agency. Thus the money spent by the Madras Government has not practically benefited the Agency people. If that is so, I think it is no argument to say that the Madras Government is spending Rs. 4 per head in the Agency. It is doing much good not to the Agency people but to other people. On the other hand, we have got the Agency tract in Orissa. Unfortunately, the records of evidence are not available to me. The Rev. Mr. Evans, a Missionary gentleman, who is acquainted both with the Ganjam Agency as well as the Orissa Agency has stated that the people in the Khond Mahals are better cared for than the people in the Madras Agency tracts. That was his evidence before the committee. Not only that. What do we find from the Statement of Objects and Reasons to the Madras Act I of 1917, which was enacted by the Madras Government on the Orissa model? The special officer appointed by the Madras Government had to go to the Khond Mahals and see what the officers were doing there and that fact you find here.

"The following extracts from the Statement of Objects and Reasons 2
may also be carefully noticed:— P

'This Act (Act I of 1917) is based on the unrepealed laws, Regulation III of 1917. The gradual dispossession of the people of the Ganjam Agency of their cultivable lands by Oriyas and others for some years past, attracted the attention of the local Revenue officers, practically all of whom had agreed that special measures were necessary to protect them against further dispossession. In September 1914, the Governor in Council appointed a special officer to make a comprehensive examination of the agrarian and economic conditions of these people. The officer was instructed to visit the Ganjam Agency and make himself acquainted with the circumstances of the Khonds and details of the processes by which they had been gradually losing possession of the lands, to consult the local officers and obtain their views as to the advisability of devising means to check this dispossession . . . and submit definite proposals to Government. The special officer also visited the Khond Mahals in Orissa and recommended that Regulation III of 1917 should be adopted in the Presidency for preventing further alienation of lands by the Khonds.'

"Therefore, we see sometimes Madras has to take its lessons from the Orissa Government in regard to the administration of the Agency tracts. Some measures have to be adopted and some officers have to be appointed to administer the tracts, and would it be more convenient to administer them from Madras than from a different province? Certainly not. Therefore it is well that all these Agency tracts are placed under one administration.

"With regard to finance, the Government started an Agency scheme with a view to develop the Agency, but practically nothing could be done, and the scheme had to be abandoned. But the Government gained one advantage, and that was, when the Meston Committee sat, the Government represented before them that they would be spending some large sums for the development of the Agency, and therefore they got more favourable terms under the Meston

award. The provincial contribution was altogether remitted. Though large sums of money have not been spent the Government could say that large sums have to be spent. Another argument is that fituris break out in those parts. I may say that the fituri tracts will always be retained by the Madras Government, the Rampa and the Koya Agency in which Sitarama Raju lived will not be taken into Orissa. Therefore, a large Police force need not be maintained by the Orissa Government. The people are aboriginal tribes and are very very mild and are not so troublesome as the Koyas and the Rampas."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" Sir, I move—

> '*that the words commencing from " and the transfer " and ending with " in the majority " in the amendment given notice of by the Raja of Bobbili, be omitted.*'

" Sir, the amendment given notice of by the Raja of Bobbili includes not only the territories lying to the south of the Rushikulya river, its tributary Godahado river, and the Mohini hills, but it is also against the transfer of any areas in which the aboriginal tribes are in a majority. I wish the words ' and the transfer of any areas. . . are in the majority ' be omitted from the amendment, in order to enable the Orissa Province to include within its scope, the aborigines, namely, the Khonds and the Savaras who are in a majority in the now existing Andhra districts. I can understand the mover of the amendment saying that territories in which the Telugu-speaking people are in a majority should not be transferred to the new Province of Orissa; I can also understand saying that wherever the Oriyas are in a hopeless minority, these people need not be transferred to the new Province of Orissa. But the scope of the amendment now before the House goes far beyond that. In one breath it says that the Agency tracts in which it is admitted on all hands the Oriyas are in a majority from the point of view of language and race should not be transferred simply because the Agency tracts are backward and require development. I do not think this Government, when the question of redistribution arises, should be greatly concerned whether in any tract of country there is development or no development. When the Agency tracts are transferred, as they are bound to be transferred to the new province, it will be the look out of the new Government of Orissa to develop them in the way it is possible for them to do so. I do not see why there should be such great concern over the undeveloped areas. We have not been able to develop them for the last several years in spite of several crores budgeted for and in spite of large sums of money having been spent over them. So it stands to reason that this Government should transfer the responsibility of developing these backward areas to the new Government of Orissa. The upshot of their argument is that, although in these territories the Oriya-speaking people—the Khonds and the Savaras—are in a majority, they do not want the Agency tracts to be transferred to Orissa on the ground that they are backward and the Orissa Government will not be able to develop them. It is

4th August 1932] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

something like saying 'heads I win, tails you lose'. For the transference of one part of the territory they apply one set of arguments, for the non-transference of another part of territory they apply another set of arguments. I do not see much consistency in the arguments put forward by those gentlemen who are supporting the non-transference of these territories. Hon. Members of this House are aware that the Khonds and the Savaras are divided in the now existing Province of Orissa as well as in the Province of Madras; the minor portion are in Orissa and the major portion in Madras. What was sought by the Orissa Committee to be done was that the larger number of people in Madras should be transferred to Orissa, so that the whole of Khonds and Savaras might constitute themselves into one single people. That is the idea underlying the recommendation of the Orissa Committee Report. Now that idea is sought to be defeated by the amendment proposed by the Raja of Bobbili. I do not think that that is a fair way of dealing with the question. Nearly 3½ lakhs of Khonds and 2 lakhs of Savaras living in the Madras Presidency are speaking only Oriya and are acknowledged to be people of the Oriya culture. If these people are not to be transferred I do not see any reason why they should be retained in a province or territory which is going to be purely Telugu-speaking, after the transference of the districts which my Friend, the Raja of Bobbili, wants to be transferred. What will be the justification for retaining the Khonds and the Savaras and dividing them into sections, on no other ground but that this province should not lose a certain portion of its population or a certain portion of its territory. On the other hand, for the last three decades, the attempt has been to bring into one group all the people talking the same language, the Telugus to form into one Telugu province, and the Oriyas to form into one province. And the ideal is also looked forward to when the Tamils would form into one province, the Malayalees into another and so on. I am reminded by my Friend that Kerala will also claim to be a unit by itself. That is the modern tendency. If the amendment of the hon. the Raja of Bobbili be analysed and scrutinized, it would appear that the object of the whole agitation that has been going on for so many years for a separate Oriya Province would be defeated. I do not think that is just and fair to those people. The Khond and Savara children are taught Oriya in their schools; in tracts where these people are in a majority, the court language is Oriya; and the officers serving in those parts are also compulsorily required to pass the Oriya test. That being the case, I do not think the Government will for a moment be justified in accepting the proposal of the Raja of Bobbili. It is quite hard and unreasonable that one set of people who have common ties should be divided in two different provinces. The Orissa Province is reputed to be looking after these people much better than Madras. The argument has been advanced and not contradicted that the Orissa Government have developed their Agency tracts much better than the Madras Government have done theirs. Therefore there is no justification whatever for thinking that the new Government will not be able to develop the

Agency tracts and that the Khonds and Savaras should remain where they are.

"*Now there is the financial aspect to be considered. It is necessary that the sister provinces should go to the rescue of the new province that is to be created, for some time to come. The latter portion of the amendment is not well conceived, and it may mean that the other provinces should not give any subvention to this new province, even though this province may require such help urgently.*

"*No doubt, Sir, separation there is but it does not matter when it is made in the interests of development of the system of administration, development of culture, of race and language. The latter portion of the Raja of Bobbili's amendment is unreasonable. I hope he will accept the amendment moved by me. I also hope that the hon. Member coming from Ganjam will also accept the amendment that I am moving. With these few words I move my amendment which runs as follows:—*

> 'Omit *all the words commencing from* "*and the transfer*" *and ending with* "*in the majority*" *in the amendment given notice of by the Raja of Bobbili* '."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The motion before the House is—

> 'Omit *all the words commencing from* "*and the transfer*" *and ending with* "*in the majority*" *in the amendment given notice of by the Raja of Bobbili.*'

"Now the two amendments are for the discussion of the House."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"Sir, after the speech of my hon. Friend Mr. M. G. Patnaik who has a close acquaintance with the conditions of Ganjam district, I wish that a representative of that district like my hon. Friend Sir Patro had spoken but instead of that, that he should have already taken the attitude of neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the position of my hon. Friend Mr. Patnaik because he is a Member of the Consultative Committee is not understandable. God only knows whether and when it will sit and when its decisions will be taken. It means that on account of his being a member of that Committee, Sir Patro is not in a position to commit himself to one view or another. Some of us who do not belong to those parts are trying our best to see if we can make out something out of these various 'blocks' and the number of divisions into which these districts have been divided. There are some general considerations which I believe may guide us in coming to a decision on the various points that we have to decide. So far as the question of the formation of an Oriya Province is concerned, personally I am not very much troubled by the question of the financial deficit that the Oriya Province is likely to get into. I believe that if from the point of view of the development of race, culture and so on the Oriya Province has to be formed, the question of finance ought to be a subsidiary consideration. It may not be possible to have the same standards of pay that are now being paid to the

4th August 1932] [Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

officers but it may not be impossible for the Oriyas to make both ends meet, if not to carry on the administration efficiently. If a province is to be formed, it is likely that there may be a large deficit in the beginning, but on that ground we ought not to be deterred from giving our support to the formation of a new province. The question of the formation of a new Oriya province on a linguistic and racial basis has been definitely settled. Simply because the general question of forming provinces on linguistic basis has not been taken up by the Statutory Commission, we should not be against the formation of an Oriya province. But the question of finance is of very great importance when we have to consider the position of certain areas which are neither predominantly Telugu nor predominantly Oriya. It has to be considered whether the Madras Province is in a better position to develop those districts or the Oriya province is in a better position to do so. There does not seem to be much controversy on one point, viz., that wherever there is a predominantly Oriya population, that portion ought to be taken to the Oriya Province and wherever there is a predominantly Telugu population, that area ought to be retained in the Madras Presidency.

"With regard to certain areas which are neither predominantly Telugu nor Oriya, there seems to be a good deal of controversy and I do not know whether I shall be able to help to come to any definite conclusions on that point. I would like to deal with the district of Ganjam first and I shall begin with the plains first. In this connexion I would like to point out that the question of dividing the portions of any area into two or three blocks and of demarcating them so that the predominantly Telugu area may be retained in the present Madras Presidency and the Oriya area may be given to the Orissa Province should not stand in our way of giving our assent to the formation of any new province. This question assumes more importance when we are dealing with Berhampur taluk. Supposing the Telugus are in a majority in a particular area but they are not so if you take the whole taluk, and if you want to divide that whole area into particular divisions according to racial composition and culture, the fact that it would involve cutting up revenue divisions and firkas ought not to stand in our way. Let us take the taluk of Chatrapur at page 22 of the report. Section A is predominantly Oriya and the Telugu-speaking population is in a minority. So I think that it is but right that A section should be given over to the Oriya Province. But with regard to B section where the Telugu population is in a majority, i.e., of about 16,000 as against 10,000 it is only right and just that that portion should be retained in the Madras Presidency.

"With regard to the Berhampur taluk, that seems to be a very controversial question, because of the composition of the Telugus as against the Oriyas. It seems to me that the difference between the Oriyas and the Telugus for the whole taluk is so small that if for any other reasons it is very desirable to have the whole taluk together, I think we ought not to stand in their way of being kept together but

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi] [4th August 1932

considerations of race and language ought to be mainly taken into account in deciding these questions. Berhampur can easily be divided into two blocks A and B. With regard to A the Telugu population is not in a majority. With regard to B it is in a very great majority. But when we take the whole of the population into account, the difference between the Oriya population and the Telugu population is very small. The taluk may be retained in the Madras Presidency. But since you can easily divide it into two as A and B, A can go into the Orissa Province and B ought to be retained in the Madras Presidency.

1-15 p.m. " With regard to Ichchapur, the committee has taken it as one unit. It consists of three estates. Two of them contain predominantly *Oriya population and the third—Chikkati estate—consists predominantly of* Telugu population. This information I have collected from the *Census Report*. There is absolutely no reason why the whole of the Ichchapur taluk should go to the Oriya Province as recommended by the committee. The Chikkati estate contains a predominantly Telugu population and it adjoins the B block in the Berhampur taluk which is predominantly Telugu. So, Berhampur and the Chikkati estate in the Ichchapur taluk should be retained in the Madras Presidency. The whole of Sompet is recommended by the committee to be retained in the Madras Presidency, but if we follow the same principle, it could be divided up into two blocks and the predominantly Oriya part might be transferred to the new Oriya Province.

" The *Chicacole division contains three taluks.* I *cannot understand* how Parlakimedi *can be claimed by an Oriya province as recommended by the committee.* Judging by the race to which the people belong, out of a population of about 293,000 more than 156,000 are Telugus. Judging by the mother-tongue of the people again, more than 193,000 speak Telugu. Coming to the subsidiary languages spoken in the estate we find that whereas only 7,000 and odd speak Oriya as a subsidiary language more than 45,000 people speak Telugu. So on linguistic grounds no less than on racial grounds, it passes one's comprehension how Parlakimedi can be made a part of an Oriya province, unless it formed an island as it were, surrounded on all sides by Oriya country which is not the case. It is claimed that it once formed part of an Orissa province. I am not much acquainted with ancient history but I believe that Ganjam never formed part of an Orissa province. It is not that the Andhras migrated into Ganjam; it is rather that some Oriya kings conquered that part of Andhradesa and settled there for some time. The boundaries also—lake Chilka on one side, the vast chain of mountains on the west—clearly show that Ganjam could not have formed part of an Orissa province. Also you will find that while portions of Orissa were ruled by Muhammadan kings from the north and from Bengal, Ganjam was ruled by the Nawab of Hyderabad directly or indirectly along with portions of Northern Circars. Therefore historical and geographical evidence conclusively shows that Ganjam could not ordinarily have formed part of

4th August 1932] [Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

an Oriya province. If in certain parts of Ganjam there are more Oriyas than Telugus, it is due to the colonisation of the former in the time of the Oriya kings who ruled portions of Andhradesa. Unless people who want to take portions of Ganjam to the new province are able to show definite reasons for doing so, I do not see why the Parlakimedi zamindari should go to the Oriya Province. The reasons adduced in the report are in the nature of a special pleading for the Raja of Parlakimedi and are not in any way convincing. Factors of language and race must have far greater weight than the personal wishes of the individual zamindars. With due deference to my zamindar colleagues in this Council, I must observe that their opinions on this question ought not to be given more weight than what is due to those of individual members. The zamindars come and go. One zamindar may be in favour of amalgamation with Madras and another in favour of the Oriya Province. But the abiding and permanent factors are those of race and language. Take the case of the Jeypore Agency. It was well known that the previous Maharaja was opposed to going into an Oriya province while the present Maharaja may be in favour of it, although he has expressed very grave doubts about the financial possibility and utility of going into the new province. There cannot be any case for the Parlakimedi taluk which is 70 to 80 per cent Telugu going into the Oriya Province.

"With regard to the Agency, I am afraid my friend Mr. Basheer Ahmed has gone on the wrong track. I do not know where he got the information that the aboriginal tribes are Oriyas. The aboriginal tribes are neither Andhras nor Oriyas; it has been difficult to make them learn either Telugu or Oriya in spite of several attempts made by this Government. The 1921 Census Report, Volume XIII, page 136, paragraph 1, says: 'In so far as the Agency is concerned there is very little evidence of the aboriginal languages being ousted by the more civilized tongues.' The best thing to do with these aboriginal tribes is not to make them either Oriyas or Telugus, but teach them their own language, create a script for it, and develop their own culture. When they are sufficiently advanced it might be left to them to decide whether they would go into the Oriya Province or remain in the Madras Presidency. It is just possible that as the Telugus want a Telugu province and the Oriyas an Oriya province, the aboriginal tribes who inhabit two or three districts might like to have a province of their own. If they develop the mountainous areas occupied by them that will be a source of revenue for them. Till that moment arrives, unless they express a definite desire to go into one or other province, unless you believe you will be doing them good by taking them to one province as against another, I do not see any reason why they should be transferred from the Madras Presidency. The case of Madras is different. The aboriginal tribes have been in the Madras Presidency for centuries. The Government of Madras have been spending large sums of money in developing that portion of the country and improving their culture. The Oriyas have to make out a case for taking away

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi] [4th August 1932

these aboriginal tribes from the Madras Presidency. On the other hand, if the tribes had been in the Oriya Province, the Andhras would have no claim to take them into an Andhra Province.

"With regard to the Vizagapatam agency, only 43 per cent are Oriyas and even that excluding Gudem and Golkonda where Telugus predominate. So long as the Oriyas are not in a majority of the whole population in any area they should not claim that portion unless, as I said, it forms an island surrounded by the Oriya tracts. Of course in one or two portions of the Vizagapatam agency such as Nowrangpur and Jeypore taluks the Oriyas predominate and I am prepared to give them up if there is no other difficulty. But the two taluks in that area cannot be given up because the Jeypore zamindari has to be divided and if the whole zamindari is taken together, it will be found that the Oriyas are not in a majority. There is no reason why the Jeypore agency should be claimed by the Oriya Province. With regard to the Vizagapatam agency, the sub-committee of the Simon Commission had recommended its retention in the Madras Presidency. It is said that the Andhras are not very keen to have the Vizagapatam agency because it will mean a heavy liability on them. It is not so. We have already incurred a heavy liability—I mean the Madras Presidency including the Andhra portions in it—and the Andhra Province of the future will certainly be prepared to incur that heavy liability in future if necessary. The Andhra Mahajana Sabha have also submitted that they are very keen about having the Vizagapatam agency. Therefore their claim to the Vizagapatam agency should not be turned down on the ground that they are not keen on having it. Representatives of the Andhra districts in this Council are prepared to say that notwithstanding the heavy liabilities that may fall on the shoulders of a future Andhra Province, they are prepared to take the Vizagapatam agency in the Andhra Province. It is for this Council and the Government to say whether after the expenditure of such large sums of money by them, the fate of the aboriginal tribes who cannot speak for themselves should be entrusted to the new Oriya Province.

"It is definitely admitted by the committee at page 25 that the Khonds and the Savaras have no opinion; they cannot form any opinion. The test for us to judge is whether their development will be secured early and better if they are in the Madras Presidency or in the Orissa Province. It is that test that we have to apply in considering whether the Jeypore agency or the Vizagapatam agency should go with the Orissa Province or not."

At this stage the House adjourned for lunch.

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.)

* Mr. K. Koti Reddi:—"Sir, my hon. Friend, Mr. Patnaik, wanted me to give the Census figures with regard to the Chikati zamindari. When I was speaking of Ichapur, I said that it consists

4th August 1932] [Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

of three zamindari estates of which Chikati is mainly Telugu. I was not able to quote the Census figures. But in the Report itself on page 24 it is admitted that Chikati zamindari is mainly Telugu. I do not think my hon. Friend can say anything against that fact.

"With regard to the Savaras and the Khonds, there seems to be an impression that, because these aboriginal tribes are in the two Provinces of Orissa and Madras, it would be in the interests of both of them to be brought together. Even if they belonged to one and the same race, the long separation has made them practically two different communities altogether. For example in Orissa most of these aboriginal tribes have no other language than Oriya; whereas in the Madras Presidency very few of them have been able to take up to Oriya or Telugu language. They speak their own aboriginal language and have not taken to other languages. Unless it is established that the Oriyas are in a majority in any particular area, they ought not to claim the aboriginal tribes for the purpose of taking up any area. Until the time comes when they can definitely express their opinion, when they are sufficiently developed to exercise the option of remaining in Madras or going to Orissa, or of having a Province of their own, I do not see any reason why they should not be retained in the Madras Presidency itself which has already spent much money and which can spend more money in future than the Orissa Province. The Andhras have as much claim over them as the Oriyas. We have the additional advantage of having lived with them, of having spent a lot of money for them and of being in a position to spend some more money.

"My hon. Friend, Mr. Patnaik, said that, since the Government of India is going to spend from its own revenues on the less developed tracts, it is just as well that these tracts are given up to the Orissa Province. I am afraid, Sir, that the Government of India is not likely to spend any more money on the undeveloped tracts; I think that the future autonomous Provinces should spend their own money, and that the Government of India would not come to their help. When there is a Province which is prepared to spend any money, why should anybody else be anxious to have these areas? The fact that the Madras Government has spent so much money, clearly shows that it is interested in these people; and it will take the same interest in the future also; and it has the capacity and ability to do so. I hope that this House will seriously consider the question of handing over large tracts of the country where the Oriyas do not predominate and where the aboriginal tribes live."

* Mr. V. T. Arasu:—"Mr. President, Sir, from the discussion that we have so far had, it appears to me that there is a concensus of opinion regarding two points. The first point on which there appears to be agreement is that there need not be any objection to the formation of the new Orissa Province. The second point on which there is agreement, is that this Province, viz., the Madras Presidency,

[Mr. V. T. Arasu] [4th August 1932

should not be called upon to pay any subsidy whatever, either directly or indirectly, to the new Orissa Province. With regard to these two points, there is entire agreement both on the part of the Andhras and of the Oriyas.

"The only point on which there is difference of opinion—and I may add a fundamental difference of opinion—is as regards the boundary line, as to where the boundary line between the two Provinces should be drawn. This Council which is only a deliberative body is, I think, not fitted to declare one way or the other as to where the boundary line should be drawn. For the purpose of finding out where the line should be drawn, no doubt the Government of India in consultation with His Majesty's Government, have appointed the O'Donnel Committee. It appears from the views expressed on the floor of this House and elsewhere that the Report of that Committee is not satisfactory to either party; because the Oriyas think that the boundary line that has been suggested by the Committee is not satisfactory and that it should be drawn lower down in the Ganjam District, and from the view point of the Andhras the boundary line has been drawn far too low and it must be drawn somewhat higher in the Ganjam district. Therefore it is very clear that the Report of the Committee is not satisfactory to either party. For my own part I think that so much of time need not have been wasted over this question. Having once conceded that the new Orissa Province may be constituted it is futile on our part to discuss whether particular portions of the Ganjam and Vizagapatam districts should or should not be included in the new Province.

"The ground on which hon. Members representing the Andhra districts in this Council have objected to the inclusion of Parlakimedi and Berhampore taluks, is that the majority of the population there speak the Telugu language. Even taking it for granted that the Telugus are predominent in those two taluks, Berhampore and Parlakimedi, I fail to understand what objection there can be to their being handed over to the new Orissa Province. From the speech of the hon. Member, the Raja of Bobbili, and from the proceedings of the Andhra Maha Sabha which was held only the other day, I gather that they have two reasons for not conceding this point, viz., the transference of Berhampore and Parlakimedi to the new Orissa Province. There seems to be a fear lurking in the minds of the Andhra leaders that the Andhras being in a minority there is a possibility of their being ill-treated in the new Province. Their second fear is that they (the Andhras in Orissa) would be cut asunder from their cultural moorings. I have always had very great regard for the Andhra leaders for their nationalist outlook. But, Sir, I am afraid I will have to revise my opinion of them if they cannot rise above the petty feeling that they are Andhras and that the others are Oriyas, and think they are all citizens of a united India. That they are Andhras and therefore should not get into the Orissa Province is a thing which cannot be understood.

4th August 1932] [Mr. V. T. Arasu]

"The first fear expressed by hon. Members representing the Andhra districts is, as I said, that there is the possibility of the Andhras being ill-treated there. I ask what foundation is there for such an apprehension. The Oriyas who have been with us in the Province, are in a small minority. I ask whether we ill-treated them simply because they constitute a small minority. We have not. When that is so, why should we presume that the Andhras in Orissa are likely to be ill-treated both politically and socially by the Oriyas, who will undoubtedly be in a majority in the new Province? The apprehension is absolutely unfounded. I may assure hon. Members representing the Andhra districts that they need not entertain any such apprehension and that they may rest assured that the Oriyas will not ill-treat the Andhras that may happen to live in the Orissa Province. It therefore appears to me that their apprehensions are ill-founded. Even taking it for granted that the boundary line is drawn a little higher, as suggested by the Raja of Bobbili, it must be admitted on all hands that there are bound to be a certain number of places even above that boundary line, inhabited by Telugu people. When you are prepared to hand over the Andhras inhabiting that part of the territory to the hands of the Oriyas, what objection have you to hand over a slightly larger population to the new Orissa Province? If the Oriyas are bent upon ill-treating the Andhras they can do so more easily when the Andhra population is much smaller than what it would be if the boundary line is drawn lower down.

"The second fear lurking in the minds of the Andhras is that 2-45 the Andhras in the new Province would be cut off from their cultural p.m. moorings. As is well-known, and as is also admitted in the O'Donnell Committee's Report, that portion of the Ganjam district which is proposed to be transferred to the Orissa Province is well connected with Andhradesa by means of roads and rail roads. Therefore it is quite easy for the Andhras residing in areas to be transferred to the new Province to come into contact with Andhradesa, and in no circumstances can be cut off from their brethren in the Madras Presidency. Besides, as was pointed out by the hon. the Revenue Member in introducing this motion, the new Orissa Province will have to look up to Patna on the one hand and Vizagapatam on the other for its University, and it would not be possible for that Province to start a new University of its own for years to come. That being so, there is absolutely no justification whatever for the Andhras to think that their Andhra brethren of the Orissa Province will be cut off from their cultural moorings. The good roads and railroads which connect the Ganjam district with the Vizagapatam district would facilitate easy communication between the two. Therefore, there is no basis for this apprehension either. The hon. Members representing the Andhra districts may also be assured that the new Orissa Province is not going to put up a Chinese wall along its boundary. It will not be possible for them to put up a Chinese wall and so cut the Andhras within their boundaries from coming into contact with those in the Madras Presidency, for they will have no money to put up such a wall. For these

reasons, Sir, I feel that the question of drawing a boundary line is not after all a vital matter. It can be adjusted, if necessary—if the hon. Members representing the Andhra districts feel so strongly about it—by forming a small committee of such impartial gentlemen as our esteemed Friend the hon. Sir Patro and two or three others. And this Committee can be empowered to decide as to where the boundary line should be drawn. It is quite easy; and so, why on this small minor point as to where the boundary line should be drawn, so much of words and time should be wasted, I cannot understand.

"Coming now to the amendment moved by the Raja of Bobbili, I think the House would do well to reject that amendment *in toto*. As was pointed out by the hon. Member for Malabar, Mr. Raman Menon, it is an omnibus amendment. It contains more than two or three ideas, and therefore I think the House would do well to vote it down. In the first part the amendment points out where the boundary line should be drawn. In the second portion, it points out that the agency tract should be excluded, and later on it states that the Madras Presidency should not be called upon to contribute any sum whatever, either directly or indirectly, to this newly constituted Province. With the last, we are all in agreement, and I think this House as a body will vote for that; but as regards the other parts of the amendment, as I said, those are not vital matters, and therefore may be dropped. I would request you, Sir, to give a ruling as to whether this amendment, which as I pointed out, is an omnibus amendment, can be allowed, as it is, to be put to the vote of the House. I request you, Sir, to direct the hon. the Mover of this amendment to split it into two or three parts and then to put each part separately to the vote of the House."

* *Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar* :—"Mr. President, Sir, my only excuse for getting up to speak on this question is that I believe I am not a partisan. I am neither Andhra nor Oriya, and therefore while I do not expect hon. Members to agree completely with the conclusions that I have come to, I still believe that I have tried honestly to form my own opinions, which I shall presently give expression to.

"There are two questions that we have got to decide. Firstly, whether the Oriya Province should be formed at all, and if so, whether it should be formed immediately. Nextly, Sir, in forming this Orissa Province, taking it for granted that one is going to be formed, what should be the boundary line. On the first question, I have given notice of an amendment which I hope will come later on. So, I shall now omit that point altogether and consider the question of boundaries alone. In trying to fix this boundary, I cannot say I have been quite logical; because in this case absolute logic is impossible. We are dealing in this case with the border line between Andhra and Oriya; and things are thoroughly mixed. If you, for instance, formulate a proposition that all areas where Oriyas predominate should go to the Orissa Province and all areas where theoretically the Andhras

4th August 1932] [Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

predominate should go to the Andhra Province, I think you will get no possible line at all. That line might zigzag about, and you will possibly have little enclaves of Andhras in the Oriya country and little enclaves of Oriyas in the Andhra country. So, it is necessary, to arrive at a decision, that we should fix some arbitrary line. The Raja of Bobbili in his amendment has suggested that the boundary should be the Rushikulya river and the Godohalo river. Personally, I think it should be put somewhat lower. I would, for instance, keep the whole of the Berhampur taluk in the Andhra country, although as I said, in making that suggestion. I might not be considered to be quite logical. There is the question of the predominance of Andhras or Oriyas. Owing to the difficulty and the nicety involved in trying to fix upon an impossible line which will include in one or other area populations which are predominently Andhra or Oriya, I think we have got no other go but to adopt some arbitrary line. I think fixing the boundary along the Rushikulya and the Godohalo would be flagrantly unfair to the Oriyas. I think it would be better, therefore, to fix it a little lower down. For these reasons, although I may not be able to justify it completely on logical grounds, I have thought it convenient to follow the boundary of the Berhampur taluk. In doing so, you will find that I exclude practically all the predominant Oriya agencies. My Friend, Mr. Patnaick, referred to Chinnakimedi and Peddakimedi and other Oriya estates, also Sergada, etc. They will all completely come under the Oriya portion. But in following the line of the Berhampur taluk, I would put Suranghi and Jarada in the Oriya portion, and I would put Cheekati in the Telugu portion. There is absolutely no doubt that we should put the Parlakimedi area in the Andhra country. In fact, one of the serious mistakes that was made by the Orissa Committee was the recommendation that Parlakimedi should come under Oriya. Those of us who did not intend speaking on this motion have been prejudiced very much in favour of Andhra and against Oriya by this flagrant recommendation of the majority of that Committee, that this predominently Andhra area should be transferred to the Oriya country. I have so far followed up the suggested boundary right up to the Vizagapatam agency.

"Then, Sir, there is only the question of the Jeypore zamindari. There is a good deal of justification for claiming that at least a portion of the Jeypore zamindari should go to the new Oriya Province. There are many considerations which seem to weigh with those who, I beg to be excused for saying, might be trying to take a partisan attitude. At the same time there are many other considerations which those who have no particular interest in dividing the territory one way or the other ought to take into account. When these considerations are taken into account, we will probably be led to the conclusion that the balance of convenience in what I may call douhtful areas, would be to retain them as they are. The considerations that have weighed with me are somewhat as follow: Firstly, the Vizagapatam agency cannot stand by itself. It must be connected with the plains and at present not only are there roads, but all transactions

[Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar] [4th August 1932

connected with the Agency are with the Vizagapatam plains; and unless there is any proposal to transfer the Vizagapatam plains as well to the Oriya country—which will be a preposterous proposal—I think the balance of convenience is in favour of retaining the existing state of things. Besides these, Sir, there are also other considerations. The communications at least at present, all lead one way—they lead down to the Vizagapatam plains. Moreover, in the case of the Agency, this area forms the headwaters of some of the major rivers in the two districts. Speaking only of the main rivers, we have got the Langulya, the Vamsadhara, the Sarada and the Varaha. These are the major rivers, omitting the Rushikulya river. These rivers have, for their headwaters the Agency area of Jeypore. My friend Mr. Patnaick also referred to the Indhravati and the Yeleru, tributaries of the Godavari. Now, Sir, it may be argued—and argued I think very legitimately—that the administrative area into which the irrigation under these rivers come must have, if possible, also control over the headwaters which are in this Agency. There certainly would be a greater chance of co-ordination of policy between the various departments of Government if the whole of this area was under one administration; but things would be very different if the headwaters were under one administration and the irrigation area which lie in the plains was under another. Besides, although if you merely count the Andhra and the Oriya population omitting the aboriginal population, the Oriyas certainly do predominate, at all events in the two northern taluks of the Jeypore zamindari (the Jeypore and the Nowrangpur taluks), yet, if I were asked to vote, I would vote in favour of keeping this area undivided, keeping it as it is, as part of the Vizagapatam district.

" There is only one other point, Sir, that I wish to refer to before I close; and that is the question which the Orissa Committee has referred to—about the division of the area under the Rushikulya system. Whatever you do, you cannot avoid this division; and merely to avoid this division, I think it will be most illogical to tack on to the Orissa Province areas which for other reasons ought to be with the Andhras. If the irrigation under the Rushikulya system was to be divided into two parts on account of our fixing the line of division as I suggested, I do not see any very serious inconvenience. For instance, I can quote numerous cases of irrigation systems which traverse territories of various and different administrations in Northern India—so many big canals going through the States of Indian Princes on to the British territory and again to Native States and so forth. It is a very common feature in Northern India, and the latest example is the Sukkur Barrage where the irrigation area—at least part of it—is under two administrations, not only the Bombay administration but the administration of Baluchistan, a lakh of acres in the latter being irrigated by the Sukkur Barrage.

" I do not think that it would be a matter of impossibility to arrange methods by which even though this area is divided the interests of the agriculturists in the lower area will be adequately safeguarded. I need

4th August 1932] [Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

not proceed to detail the methods by which this can be done. So, Sir, although I do not claim absolute logic for the boundary line that I have proposed, still considering the balance of convenience, considering the fact that, you cannot avoid inconveniences when enunciating new principles when you try to lay down boundary lines and considering the fact that where you have any doubt the benefit of doubt should lead one to leave the existing arrangements undisturbed, I think that the boundary line that I have suggested would possibly, on the whole, give greater satisfaction than the one that was suggested by the hon. the Raja of Bobbili."

* Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao:—" Mr. President, Sir, after having listened to the debate on this resolution for the last two days, I do not wish to repeat the various arguments that have been put forward by hon. Members, but I think the whole thing can be narrowed down to one or two points. The first point is, we ought to know whether there should be a separate province for Orissa or not. As for that, the Telugus of the Vizagapatam and Ganjam districts never said that the Oriyas should not have a separate province for themselves. On the other hand, the Telugus of both the Ganjam and Vizagapatam districts are agreed that there should be a separate province for the Oriyas.

" The next question is, how far the new province should be extended. The Telugus of the Vizagapatam and Ganjam Agency say that where the Telugus are predominant they should not be taken away to the Oriya Province and where the Oriyas are predominant they should not be included in the Vizagapatam and Ganjam areas. That is the point at issue. In the amendment of the Raja of Bobbili the matter is clarified and it satisfies both the parties. It means that the Oriyas can have a province for themselves and the Telugus should keep themselves to the Madras Province where they are in a majority. My hon. Friend, *Mr. Patnaik, stated that the Telugus want to swallow the Oriyas.* I may assure him that he is too tough to swallow. On the other hand, the Telugus' idea is not to swallow the Oriyas but to give them, as far as possible, all facilities for forming their own province. In forming a province for themselves, Mr. President, they should consider the financial aspect involved in it. If they are going to have a province, are they going to run the province with a deficit of 34 lakhs growing up to 40 lakhs as the years go on? If our friends are satisfied to run the province with a deficit, it is between themselves and the Government of India and we have nothing to do with them. And the Madras Government has nothing to do with it, because the Madras Government will not subscribe a pie for the new province. But, at the same time, I want to request hon. Members representing Ganjam and those representing the Oriyas in this Council to consider whether it would be wise to have a province of their own and run it with a deficit of 30 to 40 lakhs every year. It is all very well for every people to have a province for themselves, but at the same time, for the improvement of that province, they will have to consider the most essential thing, finance. If you have enough finance, certainly you can go ahead and I will be the first person to support Mr. Patnaik. I leave hon. Members to consider the desirability of having a province under these circumstances.

[Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao] [4th August 1932

"Then, Sir, the hon. Mr. Patnaik said that the Oriyas were the original inhabitants of Ganjam. I emphatically deny that statement. On this question, I wish to place before the House some historial facts. Before I go into the historical question I have to say a word about the Vizagapatam Agency. The hon. Member, Mr. Patnaik, claims that he has a right to include the Vizagapatam Agency in the new Orissa province. I do not think hon. Members are justified in doing so, because I know these Oriyas, just as the Telugus went into the Oriya tracts, they also went there as settlers, but the majority of the population in these tracts are Khonds and Savaras who are aboriginal tribes, but not Oriyas or Telugus. So, they cannot, at any moment claim that simply because they migrated to those tracts, that country belongs to them. Though the Telugus have got at least some reason to claim, they won't claim the Agency for themselves. On the ground of finance and also on account of the improvement of the agency and the people that occupy that area, it is but right that they should continue to be in the Madras province. As a matter of fact, I know that the Madras Government have been spending about 17 lakhs for the improvement of the agency, whereas they get in return only about 8 lakhs. Why are they spending this large amount on these agency tracts? That money is not spent for the improvement of the Oriyas or the Telugus, but for the improvement of the aboriginal tribes of that particular area. So, with a deficit of about 34 lakhs, is it possible, I ask Mr. Patnaik, to say: leave the province to us and we will improve it? Is it possible, I ask my hon. Friend Mr. Patnaik, to get anything from the new province for the agency by tacking it on to the Oriya province. For these reasons, I think the House will have to consider, taking the financial aspect of the new province, whether those people will be in a position to improve the agency areas, when they themselves have to go to Patna for one thing, to Calcutta for another and to Madras for a third. I think my hon. Friend, Mr. Patnaik, will be well-advised to stick to the area beyond the Rushikulya river. If they are able to work the proposed province successfully and without deficit, and if they sufficiently improve themselves, then of course they can think of improving or adding the Agency to the newly formed Orissa province.

"Again, coming to the point raised by my hon. Friend, Mr. Patnaik, that the Telugus were not the sons of the soil of Ganjam, for that I have got some historical evidence to show to the House that he is not correct in saying that. It is as follows:

'Evidence of history based on inscriptions shows that the Telugus had been in possession of Ganjam for several centuries before the Oriyas entered it from the north. The Rajah of Parlakimedi is the lineal descendant of the ancient Ganga rajas who until Ananthavarma Choda Ganga conquered Orissa in about 1130 A.D. had been, for several generations, rulers of the Telugu country including Ganjam and none of them knew or probably heard a syllable or Oriya. Their capital was at Mokhalingam which is about 20 miles to the south of Parlakimedi and which is still included in the Parlakimedi zamindari. The inscriptions of the Ganga kings are all either exclusively in Sanskrit or partly in Sanskrit and partly in Telugu or exclusively in Telugu. There is not even one inscription in Oriya anywhere in the district.

4th August 1932] [Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao]

'Ananthavarma Choda Ganga who conquered Orissa took with him a large army consisting exclusively of Telugus and when he shifted his capital, from Mokhalingam to Cuttack, he naturally relied, for support in a foreign country, upon his Telugu soldiers and Telugu officers and servants. In the Cuttack kaifiyat, the names of the officers, Civil and Military, of the Ganga kings of Orissa are noted and they were all Telugus as their names indicate clearly. Like the first two Georges of England who were ignorant of English, Ananthavarma and his sons were ignorant of Oriya but their descendants gradually adopted Oriya as their mother tongue. From 1130 A.D. to 1330 A.D. (i.e.) from the time of Choda Ganga's conquest of Orissa until the time of Veera Narasimha, the tenth king of Choda Ganga, the inscriptions in Ganjam are all, as before, either exclusively in Sanskrit or partly in Sanskrit and partly in Telugu or exclusively in Telugu and none of them is in Oriya, despite the fact that the Ganga kings at Orissa were becoming Oriyaised. There is sufficient evidence to show that these kings were recruiting Telugu soldiers and officers from Ganjam.'

"All the above facts show that though Choda Ganga conquered Orissa and came to Ganjam by adopting the Oriya language, they conveniently converted themselves into Oriyas, and, my hon. Friend cannot claim that all these people are Oriyas and that the original people of Ganjam were Oriyas. I may point out to my hon. Friend, Mr. Patnaik that they came to Ganjam as settlers but they are original settlers. It is the Brahmans who were attracted to Ganjam by the inducement of the grant of lands. So, these Oriyas came from the north-west along with the kings and gradually settled themselves. The Telugus are really the sons of the soil of Ganjam according to the inscriptions that are found there even to this day. Therefore the Oriyas cannot claim a predominantly Telugu part to be tacked on to the Orissa province.

"The next point that I want to mention is whether it will not be good to arrive at a settlement on these things by means of the amendment that is proposed to-day. It will satisfy both the peoples. At the same time, I would like to point out to Mr. Patnaik, that as soon as the Oriyas begin to stand on their legs, or even before, they will have some other communities from Southern India or from the Andhradesa, or from the north to settle. What will be their position? Their position will be as bad as it is now. There is always chance of anything happening in a new province and you will find people migrating from one place to another unless and until a law is enacted as in South Africa restricting their rights.

"Under these circumstances, I strongly support the amendment proposed by Raja of Bobbili."

* Mr. R. M. Palat:—" Mr. President, Sir, I wish to put forward before this House another aspect of the question which so far has not been raised. When this new province is constituted it will be found that it will affect not only the people between whom there is this dispute and who reside there like the Oriyas and the Telugus, but also the Kanarese and the Malayalis and similar other minority communities in this Presidency. If a few of those who are dissatisfied with this province separate and form other provinces, then the remaining minorities will find themselves more completely at the mercy of the majority. (Laughter.) From that point of view I would say that everybody who wishes to be separated should be allowed to do so. Either every linguistic

[Mr. R. M. Palat] [4th August 1932

group should be allowed to separate or none. Because there may come, at no far distant time, a day when we may have to consider the separation of the Andhras and we the Malayalis who inhabit one district, *against* about 16 Tamil districts, may be left alone to face a huge Tamil majority. The defection of each minority makes the position of other minority communities weaker. So, if this province is to be allowed to separate, it should be considered as an admission that other similar *groups have also similar rights and that a Kerala province might be* constituted.

"Now, coming to the formation of the Orissa province, so far as that is considered on its merits, I do not think that we need object to it on the ground that it would be a bankrupt State. It would be only one more bankrupt province in India among many other bankrupt provinces. I believe the Government of Madras itself is now working *with a deficit budget and almost every Government in India is to-day* bankrupt in that sense. It is a matter for the Oriyas alone. If they wish to run a bankrupt province, let them. If they wish to take on the Agency tracts which are now worked at a deficit, it will to that extent relieve us. I would welcome it.

"Then as regards the question of minorities and majorities, the Telugus and the Oriyas being mixed up, all that I might suggest to Government is to adopt the system *adopted by the victorious nations* in the Great War in forming the new countries, i.e., a referendum may be taken in places which are under dispute. For this purpose one or more revenue taluks may be grouped together or split and the referendum taken. There is nothing final or sacred in the formation of the present taluks as such that we should take them as a whole. They may be split or grouped together according to exigencies and the lie of the country. In trying to settle a fair boundary between these provinces, we are not setting a dispute between the Madras Presidency and Orissa, but between Orissa and Andhradesa. We are contributing to the harmony which should exist between two Indian provinces in neither of which are we directly interested. We, who are the inhabitants of neither, are interested, as Indians, to see fair play.

"With reference to the Parlakimedi Estate, I believe it is mentioned *in the Report that the people are very loyal to their Raja and* that they are willing to go over to the Orissa province with the Raja who is an Oriya. But it is also a well known fact that these tenantry could be influenced by the land owners to give evidence in their favour. And so we all know what weight we should attach to their evidence. A better method to adopt, in my opinion, is to split the zamindari area into *two parts, one where the Oriyas are predominant in number and* the other where the Telugus are predominant, tacking the former to the new province and the latter to the Andhra tract. Any inconvenience caused to the Raja would be negligible as against the good will between the two races which would be secured. This is really not a dispute between the rest of the Presidency, so to say, and the Oriyas. It is only the separation of the Oriyas to ensure better relations between the Oriyas and the Andhras, and so we may simply recommend *to* the Government of India this arrangement. We need not go beyond that.

4th August 1932] [Mr. R. M. Palat]

" Another point raised was that the head waters of certain rivers are in the tracts proposed to be transferred to the new province while the lands irrigated by them are in the Andhra area. After all, Sir, the Agency tracts are wild areas irrigated by rivers. With regard to that, I would cite the example of Mysore. The head waters of the Cauveri are in Mysore. Would that justify the annexation of Mysore? We know the matter is being settled by arbitration. The same thing may be done here. In this case the matter is comparatively simple, as the parties to the dispute are only two British provinces and not a Native State and a British province as in the case of the Cauveri. The Government of India could arbitrate as has been mentioned in the Report.

" Then with regard to the argument of the backward classes being left to be governed by a backward Oriya Government, I submit that is an argument which may with equal justification be used against granting self-government to India itself and the House fully knows the hollowness of that contention. I am told that the opposition to the inclusion in the new province of the Jeypore zamindari is because the lawyers in the Telugu areas live on work from there. I do not know how far that is true. Perhaps my Oriya and Andhra friends may be able to throw light on it."

* Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR :—" I beg to move—
' *that the question be now put* '."

Mr. T. SUNDARA RAO NAYUDU :—" I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is—
' *that the question be now put* '."

The motion was put to vote and declared lost. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar demanded a poll and the House divided thus :—

Ayes.

1. The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
2. The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan.
3. The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
4. Mr. R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
5. ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
6. Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.
7. Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
8. ,, K. P. Raman Menon.
9. ,, M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.
10. ,, M. Devadasan.
11. Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj.
12. Mr. M. S. Sreshta.
13. ,, C. Indriah.
14. ,, P. Bayappa Reddi.
15. ,, P. K. Ramachandra Padayachi.
16. Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
17. The Raja of Bobbili.
18. The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.
19. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
20. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
21. ,, A. V. Bhanoji Rao.
22. ,, Daniel Thomas.
23. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
24. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
25. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti.
26. The Zamindar of Kirlampudi.
27. Mr. A. Harischandrudu Nayudu.
28. ,, K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu.
29. Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.
30. Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi.
31. Mr. J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
32. ,, C. Satyanarayana Choudari.
33. ,, C. Basu Dev.
34. Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
35. Rao Sahib D. Krishnamurti.
36. Mr. G. Sriramulu.
37. ,, W. P. A. Soundara Pandian.
38. ,, G. Lakshmana Reddi.

Noes.

1. Dr. P. Subbarayan.
2. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
3. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
4. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.

[4th August 1932

Noes—cont.

5. Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
6. Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.
7. Rao Bahadur T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
8. Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar.
9. ,, M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
10. ,, G. Simhachalam Pantulu.
11. Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.
12. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
13. Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur.
14. Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
15. The Pattagar of Palayakottai.
16. Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
17. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
18. ,, V. T. Arasu.
19. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
20. Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan.
21. S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.
22. Mr. C. Krishnan.

Neutral.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur.
2. The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
3. The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell.
4. The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes.
5. Mr. C. E. Jones.
6. ,, J. A. Thorne.
7. ,, H. M. Hood.
8. ,, S. H. Slater.
9. ,, E. Conran Smith.
10. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
11. Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar.
12. Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
13. ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
14. ,, R. M. Palat.
15. The Raja of Kallikote.
16. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.
17. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
18. ,, K. Koti Reddi.
19. ,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
20. ,, F. E. James.
21. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
22. Mr. H. M. Jagannadham.
23. ,, P. Peddi Raju.

Ayes 38. *Noes* 22. *Neutral* 23.

The motion was carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I will now put the amendment of Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed to the vote of the House.

" The question is—

' to omit *all the words commencing from " and the transfer " and ending with " in the majority " in the amendment given notice of by the Raja of Bobbili* '."

The amendment was declared lost.

Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo demanded a poll and the House divided thus:— 3-30 p.m.

Ayes.

1. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
2. Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur.
3. Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.

Noes.

1. The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
2. The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan.
3. The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
4. Mr. R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
5. ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
6. Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.
7. Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.
8. Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj.
9. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
10. Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar.
11. Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
12. ,, M. S. Sreshta.
13. ,, C. Indriah.
14. ,, P. Bayappa Reddi.
15. ,, P. K. Ramachandra Padayachi.
16. The Raja of Bobbili.
17. The Raja of Kallikote.
18. The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.
19. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
20. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
21. ,, A. V. Bhanoji Rao.

Noes—cont.

22. Mr. H. B. Ari Gowder.
23. The Zamindar of Kirlampudi.
24. Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami.
25. ,, A. Harischandrudu Nayudu.
26. ,, K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu.
27. Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.
28. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.
29. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti.
30. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
31. ,, G. Simhachalam Pantulu.
32. ,, P. Peddi Raju.
33. ,, A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
34. ,, K. Koti Reddi.
35. Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi.
36. Mr. J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
37. ,, P. Satyanarayana Choudari.
38. ,, C. Basu Dev.
39. Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
40. Rao Sahib D. Krishnamurti.
41. Mr. G. Sriramulu.
42. ,, H. M. Jagannatham.
43. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
44. Mr. W. P. A. Soundara Pandian.
45. Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan.
46. Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi.
47. S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.

Neutral.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur.
2. The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
3. The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell.
4. The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes.
5. Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
6. Mr. C. E. Jones.
7. ,, J. A. Thorne.
8. ,, H. M. Hood.
9. ,, S. H. Slater.
10. ,, E. Conran Smith.
11. ,, V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
12. ,, K. P. Raman Menon.
13. ,, M. Devadasan
14. ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
15. ,, R. M. Palat.
16. Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
17. Mr. Daniel Thomas.
18. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
19. Dr. P. Subbarayan.
20. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
21. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
22. Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
23. Rao Bahadur T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
24. Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar.
25. ,, M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
26. Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.
27. Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
28. The Pattagar of Palayakottai.
29. Mr. K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.
30. ,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
31. ,, F. E. James.
32. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
33. Mr. V. T. Arasu.
34. ,, C. Krishnan.
35. ,, T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.

Ayes 3. *Noes* 47. *Neutral* 35.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is—

'Add *the following at the end of the hon. the Revenue Member's motion* :—

" *and on such consideration this Council strongly opposes and emphatically protests against the recommendations of the Orissa Committee in so far as it favours the transfer of any portion of the Vizagapatam district and of any portion of the Ganjam district south of the Rushikulya river, its tributary, Godahado river and the Mohini hills and the transfer of any areas in which aboriginal tribes are in the majority and this Council is further of opinion that this province should not be called upon to pay any subsidy either directly or indirectly on account of the transfer of any area from this province to the new Oriya province and urges upon this Government to convey this opinion to the Government of India with their own recommendations to the same effect* ". ' "

The amendment was carried.

[4th August 1932

* *Diwan* Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—" I beg to move, Sir,—

> '*that the formation of the proposed Orissa Province with the addition of parts from the Madras Presidency should lie over and should be decided by the new Federal Government when it is constituted.*'

" I have not got very much to say on this point and I will not take up more than a few minutes. My reason is this, that while theoretically many of us are agreed about the formation of this linguistic province the question is whether on the eve of the coming Reforms we should place the Federal Government of India that is to be in the awkward position of having to subsidize a number of deficit provinces. Apart from the question of the proposed Orissa Province there are other provinces proposed like Sind and the North-West Frontier Province which is already formed, etc., I wonder where this is going to stop now. Because once we accept the idea of the formation of these linguistic provinces and give effect to one, we cannot very well keep back and deny the other linguistic areas in this Presidency and elsewhere the right of cutting themselves aloof from the present moorings and forming new provinces. I would admit that the case of the new Orissa Province is stronger than that of the other linguistic areas in this Presidency and elsewhere because the Oriyas are now divided into three provinces and it is certainly desirable, as far as possible, that they should be placed under one Government. Still, Sir, I think it is a vital matter particularly when it has been proved that the proposed province cannot be self-supporting and to carry on it must either increase the existing taxation or depend upon subsidies from the Government of India. I think, Sir, it is absolutely necessary that in this transitional stage we should come to no decision that would embarrass the Government that is going to come. The new Federal Government or the Central Government will be faced with a number of difficulties. If the popular demands are going to be satisfied it would certainly not get increased revenues but may be forced to face a reduction of the existing revenues. Sir, the demand for prohibition if it is conceded by the Government that is to be would certainly result in considerable loss of revenue to all Provincial Governments and to the Central Government. Then, Sir, for instance, if the future Government is going to concede the insistent demand that the pitch of the present land revenue assessment should be brought down then revenue would be lost. The future Government will be anxious about finding out ways and means for balancing its budget and so forth. I think therefore Sir, it is very necessary that we should at this stage not add further embarassment and difficulties to those which will have to be faced by the future Federal Government of India. I think, Sir, it will be a difficult question for any Government to propose further increase of taxation. The possibility of further increase of taxation in the future Orissa Province has been referred to. I think I am right in saying that no Minister will dare to take up new taxation. So that one may

4th August 1932] [Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

take it for granted that for many years to come there will be no possibility of any increase of taxation. I have already referred to the question of subsidies from the Government of India. I do not think we are justified in dictating to the Government of India more or less by saying that we say that this province should be created and that the deficit should be made up by subsidies from the Government of India. I think for these reasons . . ."

Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"The original motion was carried and therefore this amendment cannot be taken up now."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"He was prompted by Mr. Basheer."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"I protest against any such statement."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I am glad that he has protested. I must inform the hon. Member from Ganjam that this is a separate amendment. I have already laid down the procedure in dealing with this particular subject, that the original motion should be voted upon first and later on amendments should be taken. The hon. Member would have known that if he had been attentive on that day when the consideration motion was passed and when the Raja of Bobbili's motion was taken up. That motion is over and we are going to the next amendment. I do not think there is anything wrong in the procedure that we are following."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"For the reasons I have stated I consider it is very inadvisable that we should at this stage recommend the formation of this Orissa Province."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"I second it."

Mr. C. SATYANARAYANA CHOUDARI:—"The amendment moved by my hon. Friend is an amendment which ought to be considered very carefully if we are to be taken to be serious and practical in the business that we are transacting. My hon. Friend has suggested that in the new constitution the question of prohibition would be foremost and pressed very hard upon the attention of the Party-in-power with the result it may be that the Government may have to satisfy the public by doing something which might ultimately result in the reduction of revenue. Then another possibility of the revenue being reduced suggested by my hon. Friend is in the direction of the reduction of land revenue. There is no doubt, Sir, that the financial position of the Government of India as well as the position of the various provinces would be really embarrassing in the new constitution.

"The Percy Committee, that is the Federal Finance Committee, has reported, after going through the matter very carefully and thoroughly on this question, and the finding given by this Committee is that the finances of almost every province would be staggering under the new constitution and that almost every new province will have to start with a deficit, so that the question of the provinces being able to agree to contribute anything for the maintenance of the new provinces under the Reforms would have to be ruled out as altogether impossible. 3-45 p.m.

[Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari] [4th August 1932

"Then, if we refer to the report of the Committee appointed to go into the question of the States finances, what is called the Davidson Committee, we find that as a result of the States entering the Federation the Government of India would be incurring an additional expenditure of about Rs. 4 crores. The liabilities which are being borne now by the States will have to be borne by the Government of India if the entrance of the States into the Federation should become a reality. Some of the tributes paid by the States to the coffers of the Government of India will have to be remitted, and some of the liabilities which are being borne by the States on matters military and otherwise will have to be borne by the Government of India out of their own revenues. The result seems to be, Sir, as arrived at by the Davidson Committee, that the Government of India will have to expect a deficit of Rs. 4 crores. Under these circumstances, it is only but safe and necessary that any question of the formation of a new province will have to be taken up under the new constitution in due time so that the Government of India as well as the provinces may know where exactly they stand with reference to their finances. With these words, I heartily support the amendment of my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar."

* Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu:—"Mr. President, Sir, here I stand in a very peculiar position. I do not belong to either of the two districts which are now under controversy. Firstly, both the districts have sufficiently and satisfactorily convinced the House by giving a mass of statistics. I do not want to reiterate all that and try to confuse the House all the more. There were two big gatherings, one presided over by Mr. V. Ramadas Pantulu in Ganjam, and another by Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu at Bezwada. The presidential addresses and the addresses of the Reception Committee Chairmen have satisfactorily explained about the case of both the parties. Therefore I only bring to the notice of this House that we must view this question not as an Andhra or as an Oriya but as an Indian. If you view this question as an Indian, you must see whether the time is opportune for demanding the creation of a separate new province. You know, Sir, that our country is now passing through a critical stage politically, and there is the trade depression. Everywhere we find retrenchment. Especially after the finding of the Percy Committee, we realize the impossibility of pressing for a separate province at this juncture. Further, this matter has been hanging fire since 1903. Several Committees have been formed in the past to investigate into this question, and all the Committees were unanimously maintaining that it was impossible for them to reconcile the two opinions on the question. Sir, again this Boundary Committee, the O'Donnell Committee, was appointed at a time when all the leaders were away from their homes, locked up in jails in connexion with the Non-Co-operation Movement, so that disinterested opinion could not be secured. This is a time when the leaders of our country are very busy thinking out plans about the future of our country as a whole. We are expecting Reforms very early. I therefore appreciate the spirit with which Sir A. P. Patro rightly reserved his remarks. As a Round Tabler, he knows the actual situation, he knows when to ask for a separate

4th August 1932] [Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu]

province and when not. As an Andhra, I have no quarrel if the Oriyas are given a separate province. When are they to ask for it is the question. Is it time for them to ask for it now? Is it really consistent with the policy of the people or not? That point the Oriyas do not seem to have carefully considered. They seem to have misunderstood the Andhras when they say that a separate province need not be pressed for now. It is the Andhras that have been asking for a separate province for themselves from a very long time. How can they expect the Andhras to oppose a question of this kind? (Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: In effect it is so.) It is not so. There were two schemes already proposed, one the scheme proposed by the Congress and the other by the Andhra Maha Sabha. The scheme now proposed by the O'Donnell Committee seems to be not so workable. Now, one difficulty with this Committee seems to be, to my mind, that they have not considered all the aspects which they ought to have considered in creating a new province. The Andhra Maha Sabha propounded a scheme under which they have put $6\frac{1}{2}$ millions of people for this Oriya province. This also gives an indication of the fact that the transfer of so large a population as $2\frac{3}{4}$ millions from the Madras Presidency was not contemplated or conceived by the Andhra Maha Sabha. A province of 23,000 square miles and $6\frac{1}{2}$ millions of people will be two-and-a-half times the size of Belgium. Therefore even with the scheme framed by the Andhra Maha Sabha, there is no chance of success, and there is no denying it. The information now given by the O'Donnell Committee is very meagre and unsatisfactory. The papers now circulated by either party clearly show that each one contradicts the other. There are several points which the O'Donnell Committee did not care to solve, e.g., the financial difficulty and the divergence of opinion. They have not met satisfactorily the difficulty felt by the Civilian Officers who have had occasion to go into the question and expressed emphatically that it is not desirable to include these Agency tracts and also a portion of Ganjam in the Oriya province."

Mr. C. SATYANARAYANA CHOUDARI:—"Mr. President, this is a speech more relevant to the motion already carried than to this."

Mr. G. SIMHACHALAM PANTULU:—"I do not see how it is irrelevant here. I am sorry for the interruption of my hon. Friend. The O'Donnell Committee now admits that the objections raised by Ganjam and Vizagapatam are really serious objections. While admitting they are serious, it is regrettable that they have not solved these things. I therefore strongly and heartily support the amendment of Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, and say the time is not opportune for these people to fight out a question like this before this House at present."

Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I heartily support Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar's amendment, although I could not hear him. I think his amendment amounts to this, that no part of the country should be constituted into a new province unless it is financially self-sufficient."

[4th August 1932

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Order, order. The amendment runs as follows:

'*The formation of the proposed Orissa province with the addition of parts of the Madras Presidency should lie over and should be decided by the new Federal Government when it is constituted*'."

* Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI:—" Roughly speaking, it means the same thing. (Laughter.) The constitution of this province is to lie over until the Federal Government is formed. Now, Sir, there is a saying in Telugu which means that for the marriage of a Sanyasi even the waistchord has to be borrowed. Now, with regard to the proposed new province of Orissa, even when the Telugu parts are added to it, it is financially deficient. There is to be something like an initial additional expenditure of about Rs. 50 lakhs and a recurring additional expenditure of about Rs. 25 lakhs. And to these the Agency tracts are to be added. Now, if the Khonds and the Savaras are left to the mercy of the Oriyas, you can fancy what their fate will be. The Madras Government is now spending about 15 lakhs of rupees for the amelioration of the condition of the aboriginal tribes, namely, the Khonds, the Savaras, etc. If the Khonds and the Savaras inhabiting the Agency tracts are handed over to the new Orissa province, it can be fancied what amelioration they can expect from the Oriyas in their poor financial condition. As it is, the province is insolvent before it is formed. Unless there is a subvention of about Rs. 40 or 50 lakhs a year from the Central Government, it cannot get on. Under these circumstances, I heartily support the amendment of Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar."

Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—" Mr. President, this question too has been discussed previously, and I do not know for what purpose this amendment is brought forward. Is it to discuss the same question again? Only it says that the question should lie over. That is what has been added to the main question. Anyhow, I bow to the ruling of the President, who has held it to be an independent question. Yet, I could not understand how it is an independent question. Therefore, I have to speak on this amendment."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Order, order. I am sorry that the hon. Member has not understood me properly. The previous amendment contained only three points, namely, the boundary question, the question of deficit and the question of the aboriginal tribes—whether they should be tacked on to the new province or kept in the old province. The present amendment deals with a separate point which is that the whole question of the formation of a new Oriya province with the addition of some portions of the Madras Presidency should lie over. I hope that the hon. Member will now see my point."

p.m. *Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—" Still my doubt is not cleared."*

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I am afraid I cannot convince the hon. Member."

4th August 1932]

* Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo:—" I must bow to the ruling, though I do not understand it.

" *The history of the Oriya movement should be considered.* The Oriyas put forward a plea for the amalgamation of the Oriya-speaking tracts in the whole of India, under one province, so long ago as 1902, that is, long before the Telugus came to deal with such a problem. Originally they were under one administration, now they are cut up in four provinces, as the Report of this Committee will show. So long as the form of the Government was what might be called the Mabap or Patriarchal one, these Oriyas were not at very great disadvantage. After the Reforms, when the Government became more democratic, they felt that their interests suffered a good deal. In the democratic form of Government, the elected members would rather care for their individual districts than for the province as a whole; they will care for their own electorates or constituencies. The Montford Scheme also said that the Oriya question was a unique one and should have to be solved. The Simon Report also subscribed to that view. Therefore before the Federal Government comes into being the question has to be solved, so that the Oriyas may have a home of their own, which they have not got at present. It would be clear to the hon. Members that even in this debate the voice of the Oriyas has been very feeble, and nobody has cared to listen to their voice. That is one of the reasons why we want to have a province of our own as soon as possible, so that our voice may not be drowned in the legislatures where we are in such a hopeless minority.

" So far as the Telugus are concerned, they have already consolidated their position. They have got a university of their own, they have got a medical college of their own; practically the Andhra province is in a state of formation. Not only that; the Andhras are well represented here. Except on one occasion, the Andhras have been in the majority in the Ministry and they really rule the province and the legislature. Such being the case, even if an Andhra province is not formed, there is no difficulty for them. But our difficulty in the formation of a province is because our opponents are the Andhras who are so powerful in Madras. If the hon. Members would dispassionately consider the question they would reject the amendment.

" Moreover, why should the question of finance scare us. That is entirely in the discretion of the Government of India. So far as Madras is concerned, they do not contribute a single pie. So why should this legislature object to the formation of a new province when the Government of India has decided upon it? For these reasons the amendment ought to be rejected."

* Mr. K. Koti Reddi:—" Mr. President, I oppose this amendment, and in doing so, I have to reiterate what I already said that this general question of the formation of provinces on linguistic basis should already have been taken up by the Statutory Commission. But it has not done so and it is left for the future to tackle that problem. But when there is need and necessity and a good deal has already been done towards the formation of a new province, why should we oppose it?

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi] [4th August 1932

Hon. Members who are in favour of the amendment seem to have been influenced by considerations of finance. For my part I am not worried about it. I believe the new autonomous Government, will certainly find means for running the Government. They will know how to cut their coat according to the cloth. Take Cochin, for example. It is a small area and its revenue is only about a crore. See how the Government is carried on there; and see what wonderful progress it has made in education. In Orissa, their income is more than that. Small areas in western countries of the size of a taluk or so, are autonomous and well-governed. They are not going to ask the Government of Madras for financial help. Moreover we can deal with it when the question actually comes up. As Mr. Patnaik said, the Oriyas are very much handicapped by being in a minority in each of the four provinces in which they live. As he observed, the position of the Andhras and the Tamilians is different. I feel there is urgent need for the formation of this province. The question of finance need not worry us now. So, I do not see why this question should wait till the formation of a Federal Government. I do not know when it is going to come. The formation of a new province can be done under the present constitution. I am really against putting it off indefinitely."

Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"I am also constrained to oppose this amendment for this reason. The main question whether the Oriyas should have a province or not was considered by this House. We also considered the question of the boundary line that should separate this province from the Madras Presidency. So far as the financial commitments are concerned, that also formed part of the original resolution or amendment moved by the hon. the Raja of Bobbili, so that no question arises now whether the Madras Presidency would be asked to contribute towards the maintenance of that province. We have clearly stated in the original resolution that they should not be asked to make any contribution towards the cost of running the administration of that province. We have also admitted that that province should be formed. Having gone so far, I do not see any purpose in passing another resolution which certainly nullifies the little effect that our resolution would have in regard to the formation of the province of Utkal. I certainly sympathize with the attempts of my hon. Friend, Mr. Patnaik, to influence the House to give a larger bit of territory to this province. He has not been successful. But whatever it is, having allowed a certain territory to be carved out for the formation of a province and having also said that they should run their machinery and not ask us for contribution, wherein does the question come, how it is to be formed or when it is to be formed? It has been explained by the mover of the amendment that it is necessary that we should wait for the Federation to come into being. The question arises whether before the new constitution is framed those who are responsible for the formation of the new constitution should be warned that there is also another province coming into being. If they are not told so, they may give a constitution for India without taking into consideration the Utkal province that we

4th August 1932] [Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar]

want to come into being. The commitments would then be examined by the Consultative Committee or whatever committee is set up to examine the question. So we must tell the framers of the new constitution that here is a new province coming into being, we sympathize with these people in their desire to have a new province on linguistic basis and the financial commitments have to be looked into. It is for the Government to see how the administration of the new province is to be run. Madras has refused to contribute; perhaps other provinces may say so. The Government of India would have to find out how the new province could be run without additional commitments, or if they are necessary, how to meet them. As regards the amendment everybody will be in the dark. It is like taking away with the one hand what is given with the other. In this connexion I may remind the hon. mover that only recently the North-West Frontier Province was formed. It is in our experience that new provinces are being formed. Our Andhra friends are asking for a new province. A concession has been given to Utkal for the formation of a province. I do not see why we should stand in the way of a province being formed immediately. To some extent we are committed to the principle underlying it. I therefore feel constrained to oppose this amendment."

* Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"I beg to associate myself with the speakers who have opposed this amendment. The hon. Member for the University of Madras was good enough to say that the Andhra friends might follow with a request for a province of their own, and 4-15 p.m.
my Friend Mr. Choudari said that the formation of this province might be taken up after the Reforms come into operation. I beg to remind him that when a similar question was discussed in this House some time ago and, if I remember right, a resolution was also passed in favour of an Andhra province being formed. I should like to say that we should try and place ourselves in the position of the Oriyas. Supposing that long before the introduction of the next Reforms, it is possible to form an Oriya province, will you say 'No, you shall not have a separate province until the Reforms come into being.' 'Do unto others as you wish others should do unto you.' Once we are agreed that an Oriya province should be formed, there is no reason why we should postpone it. Of course, so far as the question of boundaries is concerned, it is quite clear that there are many here who are not prepared to accept the suggestions of the Raja of Bobbili in their entirety. But that is a different matter. It is not kindly on our part to put obstacles in the way of forming a new Oriya province. Let us not show by any gesture on our part that we are for postponement of this question, more especially after the bitterness that has been created in the minds of our Oriya friends in regard to this matter."

The hon. the President:—"The question is—

'*that the formation of the proposed Orissa province with the addition of parts from the Madras Presidency should lie over and should be decided by the new Federal Government when it is constituted*'."

[4th August 1932

The amendment was declared lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:

Ayes.

1. Mr. M. Devadasan.
2. Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj.
3. Mr. Daniel Thomas.
4. Dr. P. Subbarayan.
5. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
6. Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
7. ,, Basheer Ahmed Sayeed.
8. ,, P. Peddi Raju.
9. Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur.
10. Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
11. ,, G. Simhachalam Pantulu.
12. Mr. A. Pl. N. V. Nadimuthu Pillai.
13. The Pattagar of Palayakottai.
14. Mr. K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.
15. Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi.
16. Mr. J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
17. ,, C. Satyanarayana Choudari.
18. ,, F. E. James.
19. ,, V. T. Arasu.
20. ,, H. M. Jagannatham.
21. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
22. Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi.

Noes.

1. Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
2. Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar.
3. Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
4. ,, P. C. Moses.
5. ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
6. ,, V. G. Vasudeva Pillai.
7. ,, G. Indriah.
8. ,, P. Bayappa Reddi.
9. The Raja of Bobbili.
10. The Raja of Kallikote.
11. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
12. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
13. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti.
14. Mr. K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu.
15. ,, Mahboob Ali Baig.
16. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.
17. Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.
18. ,, U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
19. ,, A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
20. ,, K. Koti Reddi.
21. ,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
22. Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
23. Mr. G. R. Premayya.
24. S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.
25. Mr. W. P. A. Soundara Pandian.

Neutral.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur.
2. ,, Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
3. ,, Sir Archibald Campbell.
4. ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
5. ,, P. T. Rajan.
6. ,, Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu Garu.
7. Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
8. Mr. C. E. Jones.
9. ,, J. A. Thorne.
10. ,, H. M. Hood.
11. ,, S. H. Slater.
12. ,, E. Conran Smith.
13. ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
14. Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.
15. Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
16. Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam.
17. Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
18. Mr. M. S. Sreshta.
19. Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
20. The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.
21. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
22. Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao.
23. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
24. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
25. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
26. Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
27. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
28. Mr. C. Basu Dev.
29. Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.

Ayes 22. *Noes* 25. *Neutral* 29.

The amendment was lost.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"With your leave, Mr. President, I beg to move—

'*that the rest of the items on the agenda do stand adjourned until items* 4 *and* 5 *are disposed of.*'

"The reasons for this motion are that the Bills which the hon. Minister for Local Self-Government has given notice of are very import-

view of the fact that various no-confidence motions have already been moved in several of the local bodies and municipalities, and also in view of the interference of Courts in some of them. I therefore think, Sir, that the House will give leave for this motion and vote for it."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"I second it."

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"I think the hon. Member Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed has made a mistake in his reference to the items to be taken up. He must have said '6 and 7' instead of '4 and 5'."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will put the motion correctly. The question is—

> '*that all the items on the agenda do stand postponed until Bills Nos. 9 and 10 have been disposed of*'."

The motion was carried.

IV.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920 (BILL No. 9 OF 1932).

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"Sir, I beg to introduce the Bill[a] to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act (Bill No. 9 of 1932).

"Sir, this Bill is intended with a view to make amendments in the existing provision dealing with no-confidence motions in the District Municipalities Act. In regard to municipalities there have been several motions of no-confidence and the power to move no-confidence motion is being abused. It is considered necessary that provision should be made to eliminate as far as possible the abuse that is being made. There have been cases in which the Chairmen have refused to receive motions of no-confidence and rejected them. To obviate that difficulty it is necessary to amend the Bill. There have been cases in which two motions against the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman are tabled on the same day. Difficulty has been caused as to which of them should be admitted. The Bill provides for one of them being admitted in preference to the other. It also provides that once a motion of no-confidence is passed by a two-thirds majority the Chairman should be removed by Government by a notification. The object is to avoid the dispute as to whether there was a two-thirds majority or a bare majority. It also provides that once a motion of no-confidence is brought another motion should not be brought forward at least for six months, and also when once a motion is rejected or otherwise disposed of, there should not be a second motion for at least six months. These are the various amendments proposed to be made which are intended to minimize the difficulties which arise in connexion with the moving of no-confidence motions. These no-confidence motions have tended to create deadlocks and also deterioration in the efficiency of the administration. I feel there is a large volume of opinion that something should be done to reduce these evils. In that view this Bill has been introduced. I no doubt intended that we may pass the Bill immediately into law, but in view of the various amendments that have

---

[a] Published in the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 26th July 1932.

been given notice of and also in view of the fact that notice has been given by Members that the Bill may be considered by a Select Committee, I request you will allow me to move this Bill to amend the District Municipalities Act (Bill No. 9 of 1932)."

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I beg to second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Is the hon. Minister moving a motion to refer it to a Select Committee? "

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" With your permission, Sir, I beg to move—

'*that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members*:—

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu Garu.
Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti.
Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur.
Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao.
,, M. S. Sreshta.
,, Daniel Thomas.
,, Mahboob Ali Baig.
The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
Mr. C. Basu Dev.
Dr. P. Subbarayan.
Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu.
,, T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.
,, Basheer Ahmed Sayeed.
,, M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
,, P. Peddi Raju."

Mr. T. SUNDARA RAO NAYUDU:—" I second it."

Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur spoke in Tamil opposing the motion for referring the Bill to a Select Committee.

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" Sir, I also oppose the motion of the hon. the Chief Minister for referring this Bill to a Select Committee. This Bill seeks to amend only one section, viz., section 44 of the District Municipalities Act. The hon. the Chief Minister in his speech introducing the Bill said that this power of passing a vote of no-confidence given to local bodies had been much abused by the local bodies and that consequently there had been considerable deterioration in the administration of these local bodies. Therefore the sooner we nip this nefarious practice in the bud, the better. The hon. Minister gave notice of a motion for taking the Bill into consideration and several of us thinking that the Bill would be considered immediately gave notice of amendments to the clauses in the Bill. I am surprised that the hon. Minister should have changed his mind so soon and come forward with a motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. The Select Committee is absolutely unnecessary from another point of view also. The Select Committee would entail a lot of expenditure to the Government and it is undesirable that we should add to the expenses of the Government when they are finding it difficult to

make both ends meet. It is unfortunate that the hon. the Finance Member is not here just now. I am sure he will agree with me that we should not impose a burden on the financial resources of this Province by referring this Bill to a Select Committee. I therefore oppose the motion that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, and request that the Bill be taken into consideration at once."

MAHBOOB ALI BAIG SAHIB Bahadur:—" Sir, in the ordinary course of events, when a Bill is brought forward, notice of the motion is given several weeks before the meeting of the Council in which it is to be introduced. Then it is referred to a Select Committee where its provisions are discussed in detail. But in this case the Bill was published in the Gazette on the 26th July—only five or six days ago. On account of the confusion in the section now proposed to be amended, several disputes have arisen and the persons concerned have referred the matter to civil courts. The drafting of the section has not been happy. The construction of the section, the desirability of the Chairman or the Vice-Chairman presiding over a meeting at which a motion of no-confidence is moved against him, the interference of the civil courts in all stages of the motion, and several such things have been discussed in the newspapers and elsewhere. I am sure many amendments should be brought to this Bill now before the House. I do not see any reason, unless one is personally affected or fears he would be losing his ground, why there should be any indecent haste in proceeding with this Bill. We have had a bitter experience of rushing through legislation and afterwards feeling sorry for it. I therefore urge that some time should be allowed for the House and the public to consider this matter calmly. I strongly support the motion for referring this Bill to a Select Committee."

* Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR:—" Sir, I was one of those who was very anxious to have this section amended as early as possible. Therefore when I first saw the Bill in the Gazette I was very glad that it was coming and hoped that it would be passed at once. But on further consideration I found that the Bill required some amendments and that it was better that it was discussed in a Select Committee. For instance, when a no-confidence motion is rejected or passed only by a bare majority, no such motion can be brought forward for another six months. I should like that in the case in which a no-confidence motion against a Chairman or Vice-Chairman has been totally rejected, another motion against the same persons should not be brought forward for a period of 12 months. They should be allowed to continue in office undisturbed for that period at least. I am glad to learn that we will soon be having executive officers for our municipalities; and a Bill to that effect will be introduced. Till then it is better that we allow Chairman or Vice-Chairman of municipalities against whom a no-confidence motion has been brought and rejected to continue in office undisturbed for another period of 12 months. These things can be discussed in the Select Committee. That is why I support the motion to refer this Bill to a Select Committee. With regard to the speech of the hon. Member from Tenkasi —I was recently at Tenkasi myself and I heard that a no-confidence motion was pending against him—I earnestly hope he would not be disturbed. There are many like him in the Presidency, but that is no

consideration why we should rush through a measure like this. We will not lose much by postponing the Bill for three months. It is not proposed in this Bill to do away with no-confidence motions altogether. But it is proposed to restrict the scope of such motions. The best security of presidents of local boards and chairmen of municipal councils will be found in the confidence they are able to command from the members of these bodies. I therefore support the motion to refer this Bill to a Select Committee."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" The hon. Member Mr. Arasu charged me with changing my mind suddenly. I have to point out that this Bill was placed before the Advisory Committee on Local Self-Government and Public Health consisting of 22 members and I asked their opinion as to whether the Bill may be passed straightaway or referred to a Select Committee. They advised that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. My hon. friend Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar representing the Madras Corporation was one of the members of the Committee. He said that the Bill did not go as far as he would like it to go and that he would like to make radical changes in the Act even to the extent of removing the section relating to no-confidence motions. With regard to the amendments before us, they are not of an informal nature, they are substantial amendments. One amendment says that a no-confidence motion should not be introduced until six months after the election of a Chairman or Vice-Chairman. Mr. Muthiah Chettiyar wants that the interval should be not six months but one year. Another amendment says that there should be only one no-confidence motion and whether the majority is prescribed to be two-thirds or a bare majority, the motion should operate as soon as it is passed; there should be no provision for a second motion after some interval. In view of these various amendments and in view of the general feeling I thought it best to have the matter discussed in Committee so that it may come before the Council in a more satisfactory form. I fully realise the great abuse to which this power has been put and the urgent necessity of restricting this power to as narrow a margin as possible. If there is a strong body of opinion in favour of restricting this power, on behalf of the Government I am willing to accept it. These are the considerations which induced me to bring forward a motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. Of course I quite sympathise with the hon. Member from Tenkasi in his anxiety that the Bill should be passed now. But we have very little time at our disposal—only 15 minutes. Even if we make up our minds to take up the Bill now we shall not be able to pass it to-day."

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" Sir, as the hon. the Chief Minister has said that this is a very important measure which ought to be thrashed out in a Select Committee, I beg your leave and the leave of the House to move that S.O. 39 (2) be suspended and that the number of members of the Select Committee be increased to more than 15. If the leave is granted and you suspend the S.O., I shall give the names of the Members I want to add to the Select Committee."

5 * The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" The hon. Member will move for both, suspension of the Standing Order and the addition of more names."

4th August 1932]

* Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" Sir, I request you to suspend Standing Order 39 (2) and to give me leave to add the names of the following gentlemen to the list of Members of the Select Committee already read out by the hon. the Chief Minister :—

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur.
Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
Mr. W. P. A. Soundara Pandian.
,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.
Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is—

'*that the number of the Members of the Select Committee on this Bill excluding the Member of Government in charge, do exceed 15*'."

The motion was lost.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is—

'*that Bill No. 9 of 1932 (Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act) be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Members already read out by the hon. the Chief Minister*'."

The motion was carried.

V.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920. (BILL No. 10 OF 1932).

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" Sir, I introduce the Bill[a] to amend the Madras Local Boards Act (Bill No. 10 of 1932) and move—

'*that the Bill be referred to the same Select Committee as for Bill No. 9.*'

" The object of this Bill is the same as that of the previous Bill. This is in connexion with the amendment of the sections in the Local Boards Act dealing with no-confidence motions. I have already explained the object of these Bills."

Mr. E. CONRAN SMITH :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

VI.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS SERVICES COMMISSION ACT, 1929 (BILL No. 7 OF 1932).

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

'*that Bill No. 7 of 1932 be taken up next as it is urgent and as there are no amendments proposed to it*'."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

---

[a] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 26th July 1932.

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" Sir, I beg to introduce the Bill " to amend the Madras Services Commission Act, 1929 (*Bill No. 7 of 1932*) and to move—

'*that the Bill be taken into consideration at once.*' *

" This Bill is intended to bring the present Act in conformity with the resolution of the Secretary of State for India in Council amending the Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules on the suggestion made by the Services Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference. Under our present Act, the Chairman and the other Members of the Commission are appointed by the Governor in Council. The Secretary of State in Council has now made a rule that any law of this nature must enact that the appointment or renewal of the appointment or removal of any Member of the Commission shall be made by the Governor. The Bill seeks to alter also sub-section (3) of section 4 of Act XI of 1929. The present sub-section is as follows:—

'No person shall be appointed to be the Chairman or a member unless he has previously given an undertaking in writing to the effect that he will not, either during or after his service on the Commission, accept any other office under the Crown in India except—

(*a*) if appointed as the Chairman, the office of Chairman or member of the Public Service Commission; and

(*b*) if appointed as a member, either of the offices mentioned in clause (*a*) or the office of Chairman of the Commission.'

" The new clause to be substituted for this is to run as follows:—

'A person who has been the Chairman or a member shall, on vacating his office, be ineligible to hold any office under the Crown in India other than the office of Chairman or member of the Public Service Commission or of a Commission set up by any law enacted under the authority of rule 13 of the Civil Services (*Classification, Control and Appeal*) Rules.'

" The effect is the same except that we no longer require the members of the Commission to sign an undertaking that they would not take up any other office under the Commission in India except those specified. If we carried out this amendment, the law will be in conformity with the Secretary of State's rules passed on the recommendation of the Services Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— " I second it."

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" Sir, before we take up the consideration of this Bill, I wish to point out to this House the implications underlying this Bill. It is not so harmless as it appears to be on the surface. If hon. Members would look into the Madras Services Commission Act as it exists to-day, they will note that the power of appointment of the Chairman and Members of the Commission rests in the hands of the Governor in Council. What the amendment seeks to do is to remove that power from the Governor in Council and to vest it solely in the hands of His Excellency the Governor. Every one knows that sooner or later we are going to have some form of responsible Government, when elected representatives will be sitting on the Treasury Benches. This amending Bill provides that the elected representatives of the people should not be in a position to advise His Excellency

* Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 26th July 1932.

4th August 1932]. [Mr. V. T. Arasu]

the Governor in the matter of the selection of the Chairman and Members of the Services Commission. Governors come and go. If we have a new Governor, it may not be possible for him to judge the merits of the candidates who seek these appointments. It is therefore just and proper that the Governor, whoever he may be, must be informed of the merits of the various candidates seeking the appointment by the trusted representatives of the people who constitute the Cabinet. Therefore, I am afraid that the amendment which is proposed now, viz., to remove the power of appointment from the Governor in Council and to vest it in the Governor alone is subversive of constitutional principles. Therefore, I am opposed to it.

"Secondly, while introducing this Bill the hon. Member said that this Act should be brought in conformity with the provisions of Rule 13 of the Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules. He has not stated what will be the effect if we do not bring this Act in conformity with those rules. Surely, the heavens would not tumble down if we do not do so. Therefore, I am of opinion that the existing Act can continue to be in force. For these reasons I am afraid I cannot persuade myself to agree to the passing of this Bill into law."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, as this matter is not very urgent, I would suggest that the consideration of this question may be deferred to another sitting of the Council. This question was gone into, if I remember rightly, when the original Bill was taken up in the Select Committee and I think that, after some consideration, the words 'the Governor in Council' were deliberately put in. I am sorry I am not able to bring back to my memory all the reasons that influenced us to have those words. If the hon. the Revenue Member has no objection, this Bill may be put off for the next meeting of the Council."

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, if I am not mistaken, the term used in the original draft of the Madras Services Commission Bill, was the 'Governor' and we altered it after discussion and inserted the words 'Governor acting with the Ministers or Governor in Council.' I think, Sir, that the change was made deliberately. I think that the reasons that led the Council to accept the altered wording 'Governor in Council' instead of 'Governor' hold good even to-day or perhaps with greater force. As Mr. Arasu pointed out, with the coming constitutional changes, the difference between the terms 'Governor in Council' and 'Governor' will disappear as the former will act exactly as advised by his Ministers and the Government will be responsible to the people. I cannot therefore agree to the motion of my hon. Friend, the Revenue Member."

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"Mr. President, Sir, this decision was arrived at, as I already stated, on the recommendation of the Services Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference. The resolution passed by them was that 'in every Province and in connexion with the Central Government, a statutory Public Services Commission shall be appointed by the Governor or Governor-General as the case may be.' The object of this law is, as far as possible, to remove the permanent public services from political influence. That is not

casting any reflection whatever on this country as it has been found to be the experience of all countries which have democratic forms of Government, that they must adopt some means by which they can remove the permanent Services as far as possible from all political influence; otherwise, evils will result. This question was very carefully considered by the Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference and, as far as I can see, the decision was arrived at unanimously by that Committee.

"As regards the urgency of the matter, the rules have been passed by the Secretary of State and they will be brought into force from such date as the Governor-General in Council may notify. The Government of India are holding up their notification to give us an opportunity of amending our Act, as, otherwise, that particular sub-section will automatically become null and void as it will be repugnant to the Secretary of State's rules. If this amendment is not passed, no one can appoint either the Chairman or a Member of the Services Commission at all. That is the reason for the urgency of the matter. The Government of India are waiting for us to amend our Act in order to bring the new rule into force."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"Sir, I rise to oppose the motion made by the hon. the Revenue Member. The reasons which he gave are not at all convincing. One reason given by the hon. Member is that it is sought to keep the appointment and removal of the Members of the Commission beyond any political influence. I do not think there is any point in that argument. From the experience we have gained already, we know that, if one political influence is removed, another political influence comes in in its place.

a. "For instance, Sir, I may mention various Acts where the Governor is given the right to nominate or appoint persons to certain bodies and offices. There is the Madras University Act and there is the Andhra University Act, according to which, the Governor, or the Chancellor, as the case may be, has the right to make certain nominations. That does not mean that the Governor does it by himself. If there is a Governor who is all in all, who knows every nook and corner of the city and the Presidency, and if there is a Governor who knows all individuals living in the locality or has come into contact with each and every man and knows his capacity, his qualifications and all other things, then such a Governor would certainly be expected to make an appointment which would be considered fair and square. But we have seen Governors have come and Governors have gone. For five years Governors have sat in this country and they have been either most uninformed or uninforming or both. If such is the case of Governors, to vest in their hands powers like this, that they by themselves should be enabled to appoint men to particular offices, is indeed not proper. What will happen? If the Governor is not to be advised by his Councillors or by the Ministers, does it mean that the advice of the Councillors or of the Ministers is always influenced by political considerations? I do not think, Sir, that there is any point in saying like that. I would only say that if in the future constitution responsibility is going to be given to the fullest extent possible, and every man will do his duty according to

4th August 1932] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

his conscience, to say that the Governor if he is left alone will close himself up in a room and then appoint a man without being influenced by political or other considerations existing at the time in the country, will be absurd. If the Governor does not consult the Executive Councillors, I am sure he will consult the Chief Secretary at least or some other Secretary concerned with the department or for the matter of that, his own Private Secretary."

* Mr. F. E. JAMES:—"I should like to know, Sir, whether it is in order for any Member to discuss the questions as to whether there should or should not be a Public Services Commission on a discussion arising out of this Bill which seeks merely to bring into a technical conformity the provisions of this Act with the rules made by the Secretary of State. I put it to you, Sir, that a general discussion on the desirability or not of having a Public Services Commission is entirely irrelevant to this particular Bill under discussion."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I hope the hon. Member will confine his remarks only to the sections under consideration. As has been pointed out by Mr. James, there is no necessity for discussing the Madras Services Commission Act as a whole."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"I bow to your ruling, Sir; but I am not discussing the Public Services Commission Act at all. It is not before us now. The amendment sought to be introduced by the hon. the Revenue Member is that the words 'in Council' be removed. I am only confining myself to that point. I do not want to go beyond it. I only say that it is absurd to say that simply because the word 'Governor' is to be put in, the whole thing will be done by the Governor only. If the Governor is not to consult his Executive Councillors or his Ministers, he is sure to consult the Secretary or the Chief Secretary or his Private Secretary, in which case the position will be much worse. So, Sir, I am opposed to this amendment."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, as there has been difference of opinion on this matter, I think it is desirable that the Bill is referred to a Select Committee. So, I move, Sir—

'that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee'."

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"The motion is that the Bill be taken into consideration."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"At this stage, we can move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, Sir. It is quite in order."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The motion that the Bill be taken into consideration has not been passed. It is still under discussion, and so, the hon. Member is in order in moving his motion for reference to a Select Committee."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I give the names now, Sir? I merely move now that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee for the reasons I have stated. If that is carried, I shall then give the names of Members."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I beg to second it, Sir, reserving my speech to a later occasion."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I am sure my hon. Friends would not misunderstand me if I stand up to oppose this motion for a Select Committee. I remember, Sir, as a Member of the Select Committee that sat on the original Bill for the establishment of a Provincial Public Services Commission, that my hon. Friend from Bellary, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, it was who advanced in the Select Committee the argument that the power to appoint the Public Services Commission should be vested either in the Governor or in the Viceroy. He said, and said very strongly, that these appointments should be held beyond political influences, and as far as possible, such power should vest at least in the Head of the Government. I remember also having pointed out then that according to the rules of the Secretary of State then in force, even if the Council should desire to vest the power in the Governor, it was not open to us to do so. It was in those circumstances that the words 'Governor-in-Council' were substituted for the word 'Governor'. What is now attempted is only to substitute the word 'Governor' for the words 'Governor in Council.' I may also point out that in the interim period between the date when that Act was passed and to-day, a Sub-Committee sitting in London of the Round Table Conference, discussed this matter and thought that in the future constitution of India it was necessary that these appointments to the Public Services Commission should be made by the Governor or by the Governor-General. It is the opinion of that Committee that practically has been accepted by the Secretary of State who has accordingly amended his rules and directed that our Public Services Commission Act should be brought into line with his rules. The point for consideration merely is: who is the suitable authority—the Governor or the Governor in Council. If my friend held the view some two or three years ago that the Governor was a better authority than the Governor in Council, I do not understand why he has changed his view now. The one objection that seems to be raised is that in the future constitution when Provincial Autonomy is given, the Governor who is vested with this power will act on the advice of the Chief Minister or the Prime Minister—whoever he may be. But what is the alternative? Supposing we keep the words 'Governor in Council', under the new constitution, it will be construed as 'Governor acting on the advice of the Chief Minister' or whoever it may be. Therefore, whether we use the word 'Governor' or the words 'Governor-in-Council' it will be practically certain that the Ministry will advise the Governor. But at the same time, if we have the word 'Governor' alone, we will be providing that His Excellency the Governor may even differ from his Ministry in the interests of public service and that he may appoint the men whom he considers best fitted. Therefore, if you vest this power in the Governor, you can guarantee at least that the Governor will appoint a suitable man, probably in consultation with the Ministry; but if you do not want to have this amendment it will only mean that practically the person who is selected by the Minister will be accepted. Sir, people who think of constitution and constitution-making and who want to be nationalists would certainly agree that that power should be vested in the Governor who though he might take the advice of his Ministers, would still be fair in the selection of the person for the appointment

4th August 1932] [Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

and be above all political influences. I do not think, Sir, any real purpose will be served by referring this Bill now to a Select Committee. The plain question now is whether power should be vested in the Governor or in the Governor-in-Council, who under Provincial Autonomy will be guided by the advice of his Ministers. This question need not be discussed by a Select Committee. Now and now alone we can make up our minds to do this or that. I have tried to explain the reasons which I think are fairly important as to why in the future constitution this power should be vested in the Governor; and the objection that the Governor would exercise this power on the advice of the Ministers is beside the point. Because even if he takes the advice of the Ministers, he can still say that he considers that he should dissent from their views. I should therefore think, Sir, that in the interests of the future constitution and in the interests of the services, of getting the best men possible, such power should be vested in the Governor. For these reasons, I oppose the motion for referring the Bill to a Select Committee."

* Mr. K. P. Raman Menon :—" Sir, it is with great diffidence that I propose to offer a few remarks on the motion before the House. I think I must say what I feel in this matter. Now, is it pretended that a Governor who lands in this Presidency straight from Home without previous knowledge of anybody in this land will be able to make a selection of the gentlemen who constitute this Public Service Commission? Certainly, Sir, a Governor landing here will have to consult others in making an appointment of this nature. Even supposing that he has been here for four and odd years, it would be impossible for a Governor to be in touch with all the leading men of the land to make a selection; so that it practically comes to this, that he will have to take the advice of whosoever may be in his confidence—it may be the Chief Minister or other Ministers or even the whole Cabinet. It is all very good to say that the appointment should be put beyond the reach of any political influence; but in practice, it will be an appointment within the reach of political influence, and there will be a touch of political bias. What is the case in England, Sir? If anybody will instruct me on that point, I shall be very glad to change my opinion. The position that His Excellency holds here is, as far as I can see, approximate to the position that the Sovereign holds in England. Does the King make the appointments to the Public Services Commission himself, or does he do it with the advice of his Ministers, or do the Ministers themselves do it? I desire to be enlightened on that point. I do not know what is done there. After all, for many reasons it is desirable that here power is not given, with great respect and with great diffidence I say so, to an alien. I am constrained to say that the result will be disastrous and will lead to the shoving in of as many Europeans as possible in these places, when Indians are available. I am constrained to say that, and I may be pardoned for having been too plain in my remarks."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar :—" I am very sorry, Sir, that my hon. Friend, Mr. Muniswami Nayudu, has distorted facts. He may clearly remember what I said. What I said was that this matter

might have been gone into in the Select Committee and that Committee might have deliberately come to the conclusion referred to. I said I could not exactly remember it at once. So, I appealed to the hon. the Revenue Member if he could not see his way to have the consideration of this Bill deferred. Sir, I asked him whether it was urgent. Yesterday, the Government were prepared to allot all this afternoon for non-official work. Now suddenly to say that this matter is very urgent and this should be done now seems to be unfair. Yesterday it was conceded that they would arrange to see that the official business was over before lunch and that non-official business might be taken up afterwards. I doubt very much if in that case they would have reached this business at all."

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I make a few remarks in reply? With reference to the remarks of my hon. Friend, Mr. Muniswami Nayudu, I should like to say this: He said that under the arrangement now suggested, the Governor no doubt will get the advice of the Minister, but that he will have the power to veto it. That raises, Sir, a question of principle. What exactly is going to be the position of the Governor under the new constitution when it is supposed that we will have Provincial Autonomy. Much of the trouble and dispute at present is with reference to the question of the powers of the Governor. Now, Sir, is the Governor in the coming constitution going to be invested with the power of veto in matters of appointment? I do not think so. Even at present I believe the Governor—that is of course my personal view—is exceeding the powers that were intended to be conferred on him under the Devolution Rules. Of course the authority quoted for the action of the Governor now is the Instrument of Instructions. I would not go into controversial matters; but the real point is this: if the government that is going to be conceded to the provinces is to be autonomous, it means that the Ministers will be supreme as the Ministers are supreme in England. In any democratic country it means that the head is merely going to be—if I may use that term—a figurehead. It will be the same sort of constitution as in England where the King's name is used for certain purposes, but really it is the Minister who occupies the supreme position, and
-15 p.m. speaks on behalf of the Legislature. "In that case, in the provincial autonomy that we are going to get, the Ministers will be absolutely supreme and there is no question of the Governor exercising the power of veto in a question like this. Even supposing we give the power to the Governor, it will really mean the "Governor acting with Ministers" and the Ministers will be supreme and the Governor cannot veto the recommendations of the Ministers in the coming constitution except of course in matters of Law and Order where the condition of the country necessitated the Governor passing orders against the wish of the legislature. If, for instance, there was a disturbance in the country and the legislature does not support him, in that case the Governor may exercise his power of veto. But, in matters of appointment, I should think, if we are going to have real provincial autonomy, which apparently has been promised by those that are concerned in this question, then of course, the Governor's power of veto will be seriously limited—limited

4th August 1932] [Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

to cases of the sort I have just mentioned. So, I do not see any objection at all to having the term 'Governor-in-Council' as at present, which, in future, when we get provincial autonomy, may be altered to 'Governor acting with Ministers'. I do not therefore see any justification for the remarks made by the hon. the Chief Minister just now."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will now put the motion of Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar to the vote of the House. The question is—

'that Bill No. 7 of 1932 be referred to a Select Committee'."

The motion was declared lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

1. Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
2. ,, K. P. Raman Menon.
3. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
4. Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.
5. Rao Bahadur T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
6. Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
7. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
8. Mr. P. Peddiraju.
9. Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
10. ,, A. Pl. N. V. Nadimuthu Pillai.
11. ,, U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
12. ,, K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.
13. ,, A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
14. ,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
15. ,, V. T. Arasu.
16. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
17. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti.
18. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.

Noes.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur, *Kt.*
2. ,, Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
3. ,, Sir Archibald Campbell.
4. ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
5. ,, Mr. P. T. Rajan.
6. ,, Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
7. Mr. C. E. Jones.
8. ,, J. A. Thorne.
9. ,, H. M. Hood.
10. ,, S. H. Slater.
11. ,, E. Conrau Smith.
12. ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
13. Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.
14. Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.
15. ,, M. Devadasan.
16. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
17. Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
18. Mr. P.C. Moses.
19. ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
20. ,, C. Indriah.
21. ,, P. Bavappa Reddi.
22. Rao Sahib P. V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
23. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
24. ,, Daniel Thomas.
25. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
26. Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.
27. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.
28. Mr. C. Basu Dev.
29. Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
30. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
31. Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
32. Mr. G. R. Premayya.
33. ,, G. Lakshmana Reddi.
34. ,, F. E. James.
35. Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi.
36. Mr. J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
37. ,, C. Satyanarayana Choudari.
38. ,, G. Simhachalam Pantulu.

Ayes 18. *Noes* 38.

The motion was lost.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will now put the main motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

'that Bill No. 7 of 1932 be taken into consideration'."

The motion was carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will now put the Bill clause by clause to the vote of the House. Clause 1 of the Bill is now for consideration."

[4th August 1932

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" Shall I be in order, Sir, if I move that the further consideration of the Bill be taken up at the next meeting?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" It has been already passed that the Bill be taken into consideration."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" If the hon. Member will put it in the form of a motion, I will put it to the vote of the House."

* Mr. F. E. JAMES:—" I should like to rise to a point of order, if I may, on that amendment. We have just passed a motion that the Bill be taken into consideration and we have not yet begun to take it into consideration. Even the first clause has not yet been put to the House. I should like to know whether an amendment to adjourn the further consideration of the Bill will be in order. I submit that until we have actually begun to take the clauses of the Bill into consideration, any such amendment at this stage is out of order."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" If the motion had been for taking it into consideration immediately to-day, probably the motion of Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar would be out of order, but as the motion has not been made in that form, I am constrained to allow the motion. All that the previous vote decided was that the Bill be not referred to a Select Committee but be taken into consideration."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" Mr. President, I beg to move—

'*that the further consideration of this Bill be taken up on the next official day.*'

" I do not think many words are necessary to commend this resolution to the acceptance of the House. Sir, already it is so late now and many of the members, I think, have gone to attend to their respective work elsewhere and further, they have not come prepared either, to take part in the deliberations in regard to this Bill. Moreover, Sir, from what the hon. the Chief Minister was good enough to say after having refreshed his memory with reference to the proceedings or other things, that in the Select Committee there was a division of opinion in regard to this matter. It may be, Sir, that I myself wanted that this prerogative should be left entirely in the hands of the Governor, but at any rate, it is quite clear that if I advanced that view in the committee stage, I was out-voted. It means that much has to be said on the other side and I should therefore like that this question should be gone into at a time when all the members are present when we shall have the benefit of expressions of opinion of all shades and nothing will be lost by deferring the consideration of this to the next official day. Otherwise it will lead to very bad taste. If we want one more hour for non-official work, they say, they cannot get, but if it is an official work, even against our will, they are prepared to go on. I hope, at least for the sake of courtesy, Government will accept this motion."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" I second it, Sir."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" The question is—

'*that the further consideration of the Bill be taken up on the next official day*'."

4th August 1932]

The motion was declared lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

1. Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
2. ,, K. P. Raman Menon.
3. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
4. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
5. Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
6. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
7. Mr. P. Peddiraju.
8. ,, K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
9. Mr. A. Pl. N. V. Nadimuthu Pillai.
10. ,, U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
11. ,, K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.
12. ,, A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
13. ,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
14. ,, V. T. Arasu.
15. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
16. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti.
17. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.

Noes.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur, *Kt.*
2. ,, Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
3. ,, Sir Archibald Campbell.
4. ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
5. ,, Mr. P. T. Rajan.
6. ,, Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
7. Mr. C. E. Jones.
8. ,, J. A. Thorne.
9. ,, H. M. Hood.
10. ,, S. H. Slater.
11. ,, E. Conran Smith.
12. ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
13. Khan Sahib Sayeed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.
14. Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.
15. ,, M. Devadasan.
16. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
17. Mr. P. C. Moses.
18. ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
19. ,, C. Indriah.
20. Rao Sahib P. V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
21. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
22. ,, Daniel Thomas.
23. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
24. Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.
25. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.
26. Mr. C. Basu Dev.
27. Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
28. Mr. G. R. Premayya.
29. ,, G. Lakshmana Reddi.
30. ,, F. E. James.
31. ,, J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
32. ,, C. Satyanarayana Choudari.
33. ,, G. Simhachalam Pantulu.
34. Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
35. Mr. W. P. A. Soundara Pandian.

Ayes 17. *Noes* 35.

The motion was lost.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" Mr. President, Sir, I move— 5-30 p.m.

' *that the meeting of the Council do stand adjourned, as it is half-past five now, and we all feel very much tired . . '.*"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Order, order. I will now put the clauses of the Bill to the vote of the House. (After a pause.) The question is—

' *that clauses* 1 *and* 2 *be passed and do form part of the Bill* '."

The motion was carried, and clauses 1 and 2 were made part of the Bill.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" The question is—

' *that the Preamble do form part of the Bill* '."

The motion was carried.

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I beg to move—

' *that the Bill be passed into law* '."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—" I second it."

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" Sir, I rise to oppose the motion made by the hon. the Revenue Member. Sir, both the hon. the Chief Minister and the hon. the Revenue Member have waxed eloquent that in all democracies appointments of this kind are kept away from political influences. I challenge the hon. the Chief Minister and the hon. the Revenue Member to adduce any instance in any country where it is so, whether it is a Parliamentary or a Presidential type of democracy, whether it is a democracy of the type prevailing in the United States or a Parliamentary democracy as it is in England to-day. Such appointments are not vested in one individual. It is the Cabinet, the representatives of the people, that advises the King or the President, as the case may be, in the filling up of such high posts."

Mr. F. E. JAMES:—" On a point of order, Sir . . ."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" My friend, Mr. James, would wait and hear me before he interrupts. (Laughter.) Sir, take the case of the United States. There, the President is elected directly by the free vote of the people; that is to say, he derives his power directly from the people at large, the supreme sovereign body. In spite of the fact that he derives his power directly from the people at large—and therefore better fitted to express the wishes of the people than the members of the Senate or the Chamber of Deputies—in spite of that the power of appointing even the judges of the Supreme Court of United States of America does not vest with the President alone.

" Taking the case of the English constitution as it is working to-day, as has been rightly pointed out by Mr. Raman Menon, though technically speaking, all appointments, like judgeships to the High Court, are made by His Majesty, I ask any member of the English race sitting in this House, whether sitting on the Treasury Bench or other benches of this House, to tell me whether it is His Majesty that makes these appointments directly? His Majesty is always guided in making these appointments by the elected representatives who constitute his Cabinet, to whichever party they may belong. To-day it may be a Coalition Ministry that is in power; to-morrow it may be the Labour Party that is in power; and day after to-morrow it may be the Liberal Party. Whichever party is in power, His Majesty always takes the advice of the leaders of that party in making all appointments. Therefore, I ask the hon. the Revenue Member on what basis he made the statement that in all democratic countries appointments of this nature are kept above political influences? Even taking for granted that we are to keep these appointments above political influences, what guarantee is there that if the appointment is to vest in the Governor, he will be above parties and the influence of political busy bodies? Sir, as has been rightly pointed out by Mr. Raman Menon and Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed, Governors come and Governors go; they are absolutely ignorant of the local conditions when they come here. Is it seriously suggested by the hon. the Revenue Member and the hon. the Chief Minister that His Excellency the Governor would sit in his room, lock himself up there and will not take advice from anybody? It is not possible to do so.

on of the various candidates. And is it seriously suggested that His Excellency the Governor will not take advice? Sir, human nature being what it is, His Excellency is bound to take the advice of some one individual at the least. Perhaps that may be a greater danger than if he consults the accredited elected representatives of the people, who happen to hold office at the time. As has been pointed out by Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed it is perhaps possible he may take the advice of the Chief Secretary or some Secretary or some gentlemen, say, like Mr. James (Laughter) in making these appointments. Is it suggested that these people are better fitted to advise His Excellency? Certainly not. The representatives of the majority party—they are the best people to advise the Governor. Sir, it was Mr. James that said that the interests of the minority communities would suffer if the power of making appointments is vested in the Governor in Council. I never believed that my friend, Mr. James, was capable of trotting out this kind of preposterous and absurd plea. I should like to assure my friends of the minority communities that they would be entirely mistaken if they should believe that."

Mr. F. E. James:—"I never made any such statement on the floor of this House." (Laughter.)

* Mr. V. T. Arasu:—"I am glad my friend, Mr. James, admits that he dare not put forward that absurd plea on the floor of this House. (Laughter.) And I wish to assure my hon. Friends belonging to the depressed class communities that in this question their interests will be quite safe in the hands of the Governor in Council. Because in the coming Reforms, whatever party may be in power, they will have about 25 votes. Perhaps they may influence . . ."

* The hon. the President:—"Order, order. I don't think the hon. Member will be usefully discussing all these things that have already been discussed. If he has got any objection to the passage of this Bill into law he may mention a few facts and finish his say."

* Mr. V. T. Arasu:—"These, Sir, are some of the reasons on the basis of which I oppose the passing of this Bill into law.

"This is not a simple amendment as the hon. the Revenue Member would have us believe. This is a serious amendment. For, the power of appointment is hereafter to be vested in the Governor. It must be admitted on all hands that several heads are much better than one single head. And so in choosing candidates for the Membership as well as the Presidentship of the Services Commission, is it not better, I ask, that a body of people, in the shape of His Excellency the Governor and his legally constituted Ministers, do put their heads together and choose the right and proper persons to fill the place, than leaving it to a single individual—the Governor? We know from human experience, and history also teaches the same thing, what will happen when such matters are entrusted into the hands of one single person, however exalted he may be. Sir, on these grounds, I oppose the Bill being passed into law."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"Mr. President, Sir, . . ."

[4th August, 1932

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Order, order. I will put the motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

'*that the Bill be passed into law*'."

The motion was declared carried. Mr. V. T. Arasu demanded a poll and the House divided thus :—

Ayes.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur.
2. ,, Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
3. ,, Sir Archibald Campbell.
4. ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
5. ,, Mr. P. T. Rajan.
6. ,, Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
7. Mr. C. E. Jones.
8. ,, J. A. Thorne.
9. ,, H. M. Hood.
10. ,, S. H. Slater.
11. ,, E. Conran Smith.
12. ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
13. Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.
14. Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam.
15. Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.
16. ,, M. Devadasan.
17. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
18. Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar.
19. Mr. M. S. Sreshta.
20. ,, P. C. Moses.
21. ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
22. ,, C. Indriah.
23. Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
24. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
25. ,, Daniel Thomas.
26. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
27. Pandit Ganaa Ramamurti.
28. Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.
29. Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
30. Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.
31. ,, F. E. James.
32. ,, J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
33. ,, C. Satyanarayana Choudari.
34. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.
35. Mr. C. Basu Dev.
36. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
37. Mr. W. P. A. Soundara Pandian.
38. Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
39. Mr. G. R. Premayya.
40. ,, G. Lakshmana Reddi.

Noes.

1. Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
2. ,, V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
3. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti.
4. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
5. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
6. Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
7. ,, U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
8. ,, K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.
9. ,, V. T. Arasu.

Ayes 40. *Noes* 9.

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

VII.—ELECTION OF FIVE MEMBERS TO THE SENATE OF THE ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have to announce to the House that as a result of the voting for the election of five members to the Senate of the Annamalai University by the Members of the Madras Legislative Council, the following Members have been declared duly elected :—

1. Mr. V. T. Arasu.
2. S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.
3. Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
4. Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu.
5. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.

" The House will now adjourn and meet to-morrow at 11 a.m."

VIII.—PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

* Report of the Madras Services Commission for 1931–32.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

4th August 1932]

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to question No. 95 asked by Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 4th August 1932, page 252 supra.]

Copy of petition presented to the Collector by the residents of Thodikana village, dated 22nd June 1932.

[The humble petition of the residents of Thodikana village, Puttur taluk, South Kanara district.]

Aggrieved by the order of the Collector of 17th May 1932 closing the Thodikana Reserve Forest for grazing of the cattle of the villagers from 1st June 1932, the above petitioners make the following appeal on the following among other grounds:—

(1) The village of Thodikana with the exception of the residential houses of the villagers and the small patches of land immediately surrounding them which is all the Revenue land in the village, all the other land is classed as "Reserve Forest" and necessarily the villagers have to graze their cattle only in the Reserve Forest as they have been doing from of old. The order of the Collector of South Kanara abovesaid has deprived the villagers of the only means of grazing their cattle.

(2) The petitioners learn that owing to the fire which broke out in the forest owing really to the lateness of rainfall this year and to the spread of fire from Coorg side, but wrongly ascribed by the forest officials to the mischief of some villagers, which later is false as the villagers themselves would never set fire to the forests which are so close to their dwelling houses and which would burn their houses as well as has actually happened causing about three or four thousand rupees damage by the burning of about three houses, the forest officials appear to have reported to the Collector to stop the privilege of grazing as a punishment. The result is that the villagers as a whole are put to very serious hardship, the cattle cannot but be grazed in the only available land which is all classed as forest land and the moment cattle are found there, they are sent to the pound and villagers are forced to pay Rs. 2 each per head of buffalo, and Re. 1 each per head of cow, in addition to the feeding charges and compounding fees. Even if cattle are found on the road side, forest officials impound them and put the villagers to serious trouble and loss.

(3) Cattle are absolutely necessary for cultivation purposes of the villages as is well both for manure and tilling as well as for the milk supply. For want of a grazing ground, the cattle of the village have all been sent to Coorg to the house of the relative of the villages in the neighbouring district of Coorg, or to other villagers, which will seriously affect the cultivation and health of the villagers.

(4) The petitioners, therefore, pray that in modification of the order of the Collector of South Kanara abovesaid, the petitioners may be allowed to graze their cattle as before. For which act of kindness and justice, the petitioners shall ever be grateful.

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 101 asked by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 4th August 1932, page 256 supra.]

Rules for the working of the Nandyal Tank Irrigation Board.

The Panchayat is constituted (*a*) to regulate the turns of opening and closing the sluices of Nandyal tanks having regard both to the reasonable requirements for irrigation and the town water-supply, (*b*) to secure fair distribution of water to individual ryots under each sluice and settle disputes that may arise, (*c*) to settle what lands are to receive irrigation when the supply in the tanks is insufficient for the whole ayacut and (*d*) to supply labour when urgently required for repairs to the tanks by the Public Works Department or Revenue authorities.

2. The Panchayat will be answerable for their acts of omission or commission if they are ultra vires or improper. The Panchayat may be dissolved by the Collector and any member of the Panchayat who does not discharge properly the duties he has undertaken or misuses his authority will be liable to removal by the Revenue Divisional Officer of Nandyal.

3. The Panchayat shall be bound to allow water to any ryot on the requisition of the Divisional Officer who will exercise a general power of revision over its orders.

4. There shall be for each sluice one or more 'Yajimans' appointed by the Divisional Officer in accordance with the wishes of the ryots cultivating under the sluice and they shall form the panchayat. The Panchayat will choose one of its members to be Secretary.

5. The 'Yajimans' for each sluice will be immediately responsible for the proper distribution of water to the fields and the settlement of disputes. They will have charge of the sluice keys subject to the condition in rule 8. A ryot aggrieved by the orders of his sluice Yajiman may appeal to the whole panchayat and the Secretary on his requisition will convene a meeting for this purpose.

6. The Panchayat as a whole having regard to the requirements of the irrigated area will decide in what order and from what periods the sluices shall be opened and may make arrangements when it thinks fit for lands ordinarily irrigated under one sluice to be irrigated under another.

7. The Government Nirgantis will open and shut the sluices in the morning and evening as required by the sluice 'Yajimans' but otherwise they will be under the control of the Reddy of Nandyal to whom application must be made if they are required for any field work or inspections.

8. In the monsoon it is essential for the safety of the tanks that the sluices should be under the control of one man having direct official responsibility and the keys of the sluices will, therefore, be in charge of the Reddy of Nandyal during that period.

9. The Panchayatdars shall hold office for three years and shall be

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

Friday, the 5th August 1932

The House met at eleven of the clock, Mr. President (the hon. Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI) in the Chair.

PRESENT :

Usman Sahib Bahadur, *Kt.*, The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed.
Krishnan Nayar, *Kt.*, The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M.
Stokes, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. H. G.
Muniswami Nayudu, The hon. Diwan Bahadur B.
Rajan, The hon. Mr. P. T.
Kumaraswami Reddiyar, The hon. Diwan Bahadur S.
Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.
Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur.
Alamelumangathayaramma, Mrs. K.
Arasu, Mr. V. T.
Ari Gowder, Mr. H. B.
Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur R. N.
Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
Basu Dev, Mr. C.
Bayappa Reddi, Mr. P.
Beyabani Sahib Bahadur, S. M. K.
Bhanoji Rao, Mr. A. V.
Devadasan, Mr. M.
Dharmalingam Pillai, Rao Sahib V.
Ellappa Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur S.
Harischandrudu Nayudn, Mr. A.
Hood, I.C.S., Mr. H. M.
Hutton, Mr. A. W.
Indriah, Mr. C.
Jagannatham, Mr. H. M.
James, Mr. F. E.
Jones, I.C.S., Mr. C. E.
Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu, Mr. K.
Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur P.
Kolanda Reddi, Rai Sahib C.
Koti Reddi, Mr. K.
Krishnamurti, Rao Sahib D.
Krishnan, Mr. C.
Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri, The
Kuppuswami Choudari, Mr. J.
Lakshmana Reddi, Mr. G.
Luker, Mr. F. G.
Madanagopal Nayudu, Mr. R.
Madhusoodhanan Thangal, Mr. P.
Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
Manikkavelu Nayakar, Mr. M. A.
Moidoo Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur T. M.
Moses, Mr. P. C.
Muniswami Pillai, Rao Sahib V. I.
Muthiah Chettiyar, Mr. M. A.
Muthu Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur P. C.
Nachiyappa Gounder, Mr. K. A.
Nadimuthu Pillai, Mr. A. Pl. N. V.
Nanjappa Bahadur, Subadar-Major S. A.
Narasa Reddi, Mr. T.
Narasimhaswami, Mr. D. V.
Narayanan Nambiyar, Mr. V. P.
Narayanaswami Pillai, Rao Bahadur T. M.
Natesa Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur C.
Palat, Mr. R. M.
Pannirselvam, Rao Bahadur A. T.
Patnaik Mahasayo, Sriman M. G.
Patro, *Kt.*, Rao Bahadur Sir A. P.
Pattagar of Palayakottai, The
Peddiraju, Mr. P.
Pocker Sahib Bahadur, B.
Premayya, Mr. G. R.
Rajagopala Pillai, Mr. P. V.
Raja of Bobbili, The
Raja of Kallikote, The
Ramachandra Padayachi, Mr. P. K.
Ramalingam Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur T. A.
Ramamurti, Pandit Ganala.
Raman Menon, Mr. K. P.
Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. T. S.
Ramaswami Mudaliyar, Mr. V. M.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. A.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. G.
Rangaswami Reddi, Mr. M. B.
Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur C. S.
Sabajanandam, Swami A. S.
Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, Mr.
Satyanarayana Choudari, Mr. C.
Sesha Reddi, Mr. B. P.
Shetty, Mr. A. B.
Singam Ayyangar, Mr. K.
Siva Raj, Rao Sahib N.
Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar, Mr. K. S.

PRESENT—*cont.*

Slater, C.M.G., C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. S. H.
Smith, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. E. C.
Soundara Pandian, Mr. W. P. A.
Sreshta, Mr. M. S.
Srinivasa Ayyangar, Mr. T. C.
Srinivasan, Rao Bahadur R.
Sriramulu, Mr. G.
Stanes, Mr. F. J.
Subbarayan, Dr. P.
Subrahmanya Chetti, Rao Sahib P.
Subrahmanya Bhatt, Mr. U. C.
Sundara Rao Nayudu, Mr. T.
Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur, Khan Sahib.
Thomas, Mr. Daniel.
Thorne, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. J. A.
Venkatachala Reddiyar, Mr. K. C. M.
Venugopal Nayudu, Rao Bahadur R. K.
Zamindar of Kirlampudi, The.
Zamindar of Mirzapuram, The.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS

Law and Order—General

Political Meetings organized by Government Officials to combat the Civil Disobedience Movement.

* 121 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether Government officials are required to hold political meetings to combat the civil disobedience meetings, and, if so, the principles, if any, the Government have laid down for such officers in organizing and conducting such meetings?

A.—Government officials are not required to hold political meetings to combat Civil Disobedience, but discretion is given to them to adopt such measures of counter-propaganda as they find suitable.

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—" With regard to the answer that discretion is given to adopt such measures of counter-propaganda as they find suitable, may I know whether Government have issued any circular that discretion should be exercised in such and such manner or in certain respects? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—" Government have issued instructions saying that discretion should be used and that force should be used to the very minimum."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—" May I know whether a copy of it will be placed on the table of the House? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—" It is a confidential circular."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" Arising out of the answer given by the Home Member, may I know where the question of minimum force comes in? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—" I was under the wrong impression that my hon. Friend asked the supplementary question in connexion with the next question. I find now it is different."

5th August 1932]

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"The question relates to political meetings and the answer also relates to that."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"With regard to discretion, Sir, all that we said was that they should use their influence to combat the Civil Disobedience Movement. Government consider it to be a lawless movement whose object is to bring chaos and anarchy in the country. It is the duty of the officials to use their healthy influence to combat such a movement."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I know if counter-propaganda consists in the using of minimum force?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"As I said, I thought my hon. Friend asked about next question."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know if reports of meetings so held are sent to the Government?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I do not think Government officials have convened any meetings to put down the Civil Disobedience Movement."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Is the hon. the Home Member not aware that such meetings are held in East Godavari?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"In what month, may I know?"

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"In any month during the Civil Disobedience Movement?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"In connexion with the no-tax campaign certain meetings were held and in these meetings some resolutions of loyalty were passed. I do not think there is anything wrong."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Under a misapprehension the Home Member answered with reference to the using of force."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I have explained that."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"You were always thinking of force?"

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"In view of the two answers that were given thinking that they were with regard to force, may I know what is the discretion that is allowed to the Government servants with regard to propaganda that they should do in order to combat the Civil Disobedience Movement?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"They must use their influence in maintaining law and order in the country."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Is it not a fact in Godavari, Revenue officials have been holding political meetings?"

[5th August 1932

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
"I don't think they have been holding political meetings."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Have the officers done their duty with regard to such instructions?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
"Yes."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know if the Government will be pleased to lay on the table the order issued by Government to their officers in asking them to use their discretion?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
"No, Sir. They are confidential."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Is it a fact that Government have sent an order to that effect?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
"We have passed orders to the effect that it is the duty of the Government servants to use their utmost influence to see that this movement is put down as early as possible."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"If what the hon. Member said is a summary, what objection is there for the Government to publish those instructions in seriatim and place it on the table of this House?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
"These instructions are confidential."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Does it contain any other information?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
"It is against public interest to publish them."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"What is the nature of the propaganda that is permitted to Government officials?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
"It is left to their discretion."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"Even in cases where propaganda are not carried on, is it a fact that reports are being sent about meetings held?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
"I am thankful to the hon. Member for the information."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"How does the Government justify their action in including Judicial officers also in the category of officers to carry on the propaganda?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
"It is the duty of the Judicial officers also to maintain Law and Order."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"What steps have Government taken in cases where Government have acted against their instructions?"

5th August 1932].

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— "There have been no such cases."

Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR:—" Is the Government aware of the fact that this propaganda, instead of putting down the Movement, will be an incentive to it?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— "I do not think so."

Alleged beating of toddy shop picketers in Kambakone village.

* 122 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that on or about the 28th April 1932 four picketers peacefully picketed a toddy shop in Kambakone village near Baindur in South Kanara;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that the police and the sub-inspector belaboured the picketers severely with lathis and the picketers fell senseless;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that water was sprinkled on them and given them to drink;

(*d*) whether after they became conscious they were again beaten by the police;

(*e*) whether when they were so belaboured again the fisherwomen who had gathered unable to bear the sight cried out for help; and whether the people, that had gathered, beat the police with cadjan sticks to save the boys from being killed; and

(*f*) whether the four picketers were given any medical assistance; if so, into which hospital they were admitted and whether the hon. the Home Member would be pleased to place a copy of a statement of the medical officer that treated them regarding the number and the nature of the wounds?

A.—(*a*) The hon. Member apparently has in mind an incident at the Uppunda toddy shop in Nandavana near Byndoor of Coondapoor taluk on 27th April. On that day 4 Brahman youths and 4 fisher youths picketed the shop in company with a small crowd. They were not only exhorting the public not to drink, but were restraining customers from entering the shop.

(*b*) The facts are reported to be as follows:—

The Sub-Inspector warned the volunteers and the crowd that they formed an unlawful assembly and repeatedly ordered them to disperse. The volunteers refused to move. The Sub-Inspector pushed two of the volunteers away and gave them a few cuts with his cane on the legs. They sat down and feigned inability to stand. The constables did not beat anybody.

(c) Some water was by order of the Sub-Inspector sprinkled on the heads of the seated volunteers for the purpose of making them get up.

(d) No.

(e) The crowd of fisher-folk increased to about 100 strong and suddenly grew excited. They armed themselves with cadjan sticks, surrounded the Police and set upon them from behind. The volunteers also got up and joined in the attack. The Sub-Inspector was pushed for a distance of a furlong and beaten on the head and back. When the constables used their lathis, they were also snatched away and the constables were repeatedly struck.

(f) From the fact that the volunteers received only a few cuts about the legs and then got up and joined in the assault on the Police it does not appear that they required any medical attention. The Government have no information that they were admitted to any hospital. The District Magistrate himself visited the place and made personal enquiries.

Alleged severe beating of Attluri Jayaramaya of Vanapamula in Bezwada.

* 123 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that in May 1932 the Police beat Mr. Attluri Jayaramaya of Vanapamula in Bezwada and that his ribs were broken on account of the severity of the lathi blows given by the Police; and

(b) if so, under what circumstances was the said beating given and where, and whether the Police gave him medical assistance after the beating; if so, will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to place on the table of the House a statement showing the number and nature of the injuries received by him and the remarks of the medical officer who attended regarding the same?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have no information of any such occurrence. If it had occurred it was open to the person injured to complain to the District Magistrate.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"May I know whether the Government will be pleased to call for the information?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Yes, Sir."

Prisons and Prisoners

Health of the Civil Disobedience Prisoners.

*124 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state monthwar for 1932 for each jail the number of deaths and of cases of illness among the Civil Disobedience prisoners?

A.—The Government have no information.

5th August 1932].

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask the Government to call for the information?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I will consider my hon. Friend's suggestion."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I ask the hon. the Law Member whether it is a fact that many of the C class prisoners are suffering from dysentery?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I am not aware of it."

Finance

Action taken on the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee.

* 125 *Q.*—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) what recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee have been given effect to;

(*b*) which of the recommendations have not been accepted by the Government and what the respective reasons are why the Government could not accept them;

(*c*) what the financial cost of such abatement of the recommendations is; and

(*d*) what department of the Government is in which there has been the largest retrenchment of expenditure?

A.—(*a*) The hon. Member is referred to Table B, Appendix III of the Retrenchment Committee's Report. This shows which recommendations were accepted up to 1st March 1932. A further list [a] is appended (Statement I) showing which of the Retrenchment Committee's proposals which were shown in Table C as under consideration on 1st March 1932, have been accepted up to 15th July 1932.

(*b*) & (*c*) A statement [a] (Statement II) is appended showing the recommendations of the Committee which were rejected—

(i) up to 1st March 1932 (vide Table D, Appendix III of the Retrenchment Committee's Report); and

(ii) from 1st March 1932 to 15th July 1932.

This statement also shows the financial value of the recommendations and the reasons for rejecting them.

(*d*) The statement [a] appended (Statement III) shows the financial result of savings effected at the instance of the Retrenchment Committee. The figures in column (3) are the estimates made by the departments concerned of the savings anticipated.

It is not practicable to arrange these retrenchments entirely by departments as the cost of certain services such as stationery and pensions, etc., are not distributed among

[a] Printed as Appendix I on pages 401—410 infra.

departments and certain other retrenchments in items common to several major heads and shown separately in the list were effected by general orders, without calculating the effect on individual departments or major heads.

Religious and Charitable Endowments

Nominations to the Temple Committees in the Trichinopoly district.

* 126 *Q.*—Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state when and how he proposes to make the nominations to the Temple Committees in the Trichinopoly district?

A.—The Government do not propose to make nominations to the Temple Committees in the district.

Agriculture

Enforcement of the Madras Cotton Control Act of 1932.

* 127 *Q.*—Mr. V. T. Arasu: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state when and in what areas the Government propose to bring into force the Madras Cotton Control Act of 1932?

A.—The Madras Cotton Control Act, 1932, has been brought into force in the districts of Madura, Ramnad, Tinnevelly and Coimbatore with effect from 12th July 1932.

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether the Cotton Control Act has been introduced in all the districts mentioned, or in portions of each of the districts?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"Areas in which Pulichai cotton has been grown."

Education

Personnel of the Text-book Committee.

* 128 *Q.*—Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) who the ladies and gentlemen are who constitute the Text-book Committee; and

(*b*) what the principle is on the basis of which members of this Committee are appointed?

A.—(*a*) A list* of members of the committee is appended.

(*b*) The principles of constitution of the committee are embodied in rule 9 of the rules relating to the committee which is as follows:

Rule 9.—The Committee shall consist of not more than 40 members exclusive of the President, of whom 18

shall be elected by District Secondary Education Boards as shown below and the remaining 22 shall be nominated by the Director subject to the approval of the Government:—

District Secondary Education Boards.	Number of members. to be elected.
Ganjam	1
Vizagapatam	1
Godavari	1
Kistna	1
South Arcot	1
Tanjore	1
Trichinopoly	1
Madura	1
Ramnad	1
Tinnevelly	1
Coimbatore	1
Salem	1
Malabar	1
South Kanara	1
Guntur and Nellore	1
Bellary and Anantapur ...	1
Kurnool and Cuddapah ...	1
North Arcot and Chittoor ...	1
Total ...	18

NOTE.—Where two districts are mentioned the elections will be held alternately by the District Secondary Education Boards of those districts. The first election under these rules will be held by the Guntur, Bellary, Kurnool and North Arcot Boards.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know the principles which guide the Government in having a committee of 40 members where there is a majority of nominated members? I wish to know the principle involved in the nominations."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"Men most suitable for this kind of work are nominated."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"What is the policy involved in having a representative for each district?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"No particular policy, one man for each district."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"In view of the fact that there are so many non-graduates in these committees, will the Government see that these committees are constituted with non-officials who are well versed in languages and subjects as well as officials?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"There is no need for any revision of the constitution."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" How many members of these boards are themselves authors or publishers of books? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" I want notice."

Amalgamation of Muslim and non-Muslim schools in the Saidapet Municipality.

* 129 *Q.*—Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN: " Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state whether any Muslim Association of Saidapet has sent any representation to the Government on the amalgamation by the Chairman of the Saidapet Municipality of Muslim with non-Muslim schools in his municipality?

A.—Yes.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" May I know if the hon. Minister knows that this was the only Muslim school that has been amalgamated and in view of the Muslim Education Committee and their recommendation that this amalgamation should wait, will the Government put off the amalgamation? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" The matter has been referred to the Chairman and on receipt of his reply the matter will be carefully considered."

Excise

Exemption of clerks in the Excise Department from the rule regarding height for appointment as Excise Sub-Inspectors.

* 130 *Q.*—Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the rules made by the Madras Services Commission do not contain any exemption with regard to exemption of height rules of clerks already employed in the Excise Department being appointed as Sub-Inspectors in the Excise Department;

(*b*) whether any memorial has been received from the Non-Gazetted Excise Officers with regard to the hardship caused by the present rules; and

(*c*) whether it is a fact that exemptions have been granted to a certain number of clerks who have been deemed fit to act as Sub-Inspectors before May 1931, and if so, whether such exemption does not hold good in respect of those to whom they were granted till they have been actually appointed to the post ?

A.—(*a*) The Government are not aware of any rules made by the Madras Services Commission on the subject. The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the Statutory Rules issued by Government for the Madras Excise Subordinate Service published at pages 644–647 of Part I of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 19th May 1931. No person is eligible for appointment as Sub-Inspector of Excise unless he possesses the qualifications prescribed in rule 5 (*c*) of these rules.

5th August 1932]

(b) The Madras Non-Gazetted Excise Officers' Association made a representation.

(c) The answer to the first part of the clause is in the affirmative. The exemptions granted ceased to be valid when the Statutory Rules referred to in the answer to clause (a) came into force, unless the clerks had been appointed Sub-Inspectors before the issue of these rules.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"With reference to the answer to clause (c), may I know whether it has not been working as a hardship in respect of clerks who have joined the department before or in 1931 in the prospect of being appointed as Sub-Inspectors?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"Statutory rules have to be adhered to. There is no provision for any exemption at all."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know what consideration the Government propose to give to the representations made by the Madras Non-Gazetted Excise Officers' Association?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"Notice."

Proposal to re-open the toddy and arrack shops in Tiruchengodu and Rasipur taluks.

* 131 *Q.*—K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal to re-open the toddy and arrack shops that were closed in Tiruchengodu and Rasipur taluks some time ago;

(b) if so, which are the shops to be re-opened;

(c) what the reasons are for re-opening these shops;

(d) whether the Commissioner of Excise has been to these taluks and enquired into the matter;

(e) what the result is of the enquiry;

(f) if the answer to clause (d) be in the affirmative, why no intimation was sent to the District Representatives in the Legislative Council to be present at the enquiry; and

(g) whether a copy of the Commissioner's order on the enquiry will be placed on the table with the copies of the connected papers which led the Commissioner to pass such an order?

A.—(a) The Commissioner of Excise has made such a proposal.

(b) The Commissioner has proposed the re-opening of all the arrack and toddy shops in those parts of the taluks of Tiruchengodu and Namakkal and in that part of the sub-taluk of Rasipur which were constituted as a 'dry' area in the Salem district.

(c) The shops have not yet been re-opened. The proposal is under the consideration of Government.

(d) Yes.

(e) The Commissioner has formed the conclusion that the experiment has proved a failure.

(f) The Commissioner was in the area from June 29th till July 7th and wide publicity was given to his visit and the purpose of it.

(g) The Commissioner has not passed any orders. He has made a report to Government who are considering it.

[For further list of starred questions and answers, please see page 347 infra.]

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS

Forest

Utilization of fodder supply in Government forests.

132 *Q.*—Mr. K. SINGAM AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) the facilities given to the ryots of this Presidency to utilize the fodder supply growing in Government forests;

(*b*) whether there are any parts of the Government forests, which though abounding in grass, are closed to cattle grazing for ever;

(*c*) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to the fact that forest grazing area of this Presidency is inadequate to supply the wants of the cattle;

(*d*) whether Government intend in any way to meet the inadequacy of fodder supply; and

(*e*) whether the grass depots of Government are sold off annually or how they are disposed of?

A.—(*a*) Grazing permits are issued at low rates. Grass cutting is also allowed—generally free in the case of head-loads though in some cases cart-loads as well are allowed to be removed free of charge. In 1929, the Forest Department was directed to encourage the cutting of grass in reserved forests and as an experiment to allow in certain places cattle to be penned and grass cut and taken to them.

(*b*) Grazing is permanently prohibited in a few forests.

(*c*) It has been brought to the notice of Government that there is never sufficient grazing for the whole of the inferior cattle which will continue to take out permits while the existing low scale of grazing fee is in force.

(*d*) There is nothing that the Forest Department can do beyond except to conserve the existing stocks by regulation. The production of better grasses would involve irrigation and an expense which would be irrecoverable in the shape of grazing fees.

(*e*) There are no Government grass depots.

5th August 1932].

Irrigation

Confirmation of the temporary employees engaged on the Cauvery-Mettur Project.

133 *Q.*—Mr. MAHBOOB ALI BAIG: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the terms of engagement of temporary employees in the Cauvery-Mettur Project;

(*b*) why they have been distributed to the circles of the Public Works Department for purposes of confirmation;

(*c*) on what principles was this distribution made;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that the temporary employees in the Cauvery-Mettur Project gave declaration that they clearly understood that their engagement would cease with the completion of the work on which they were engaged;

(*e*) the number of temporary employees so distributed to the various circles and their periods of service;

(*f*) how this distribution affects the prospects of the employees already serving in the regular circles expecting to be made permanent;

(*g*) whether any memorials have been submitted by the employees referred to in clause (*f*) and, if so, what the points of representation are; and

(*h*) if so, whether any orders have been passed thereon and what the replies to the several points are?

A.—(*a*) There are no special terms of engagement for the ordinary temporary employees on the Cauvery-Mettur Project.

(*b*) The distribution was made because under the Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules issued by the Secretary of State all temporary posts are temporary additions to the cadre of a service and service in a temporary post counts as probation for admission to the service and the holders of such posts are entitled to substantive appointment to the service in their turn after completion of probation and there are no permanent posts in the Cauvery-Mettur Project to which they can be appointed substantively.

(*c*) The number of temporary Project employees in each class were distributed among the circles in the proportion of the permanent strength of the circles in that class.

(*d*) The Government are not aware that the fact is as stated but in any case such a declaration could not override the Statutory rules.

(*e*) Eighty-eight clerks, eleven typists, sixteen draughtsmen and six tracers. The Government are not aware of the periods of service of each of these employees.

(*f*) As a result of the distribution, the temporary men working in the Cauvery-Mettur Project obtained the same rights to substantive appointment as those working in the circles and such of the former as completed their probation earlier take precedence for this purpose over such of the latter as completed their probation later.

[5th August 1932

(g) Memorials have been received from certain temporary clerks employed in the Madras City stating that the distribution of the Cauvery-Mettur Project men over other circles would have an adverse effect on their prospects and that the orders of Government should not be applied to them because they were selected by the Staff Selection Board.

(h) The Government declined to reconsider their orders.

Agriculture

Expenditure on the livestock section of the Agricultural Department from 1919 up to date.

134 *Q.*—Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to place on the Council table—

(a) a statement of the annual expenditure on the livestock section of the Agricultural Department, from the year 1919 to this date; and

(b) (1) a statement of sums expended on buying and distributing of premium bulls, and (2) a statement of sums expended during the said period as subsidies for the maintenance of the bulls so distributed?

A.—(a) Please see Appendix (i).[a]

(b) (1) No amount has been spent.

(2) A statement of sums expended from the year 1921–22 to 1931–32 on account of premium for the maintenance of the breeding bulls is attached Appendix (ii).[a]

Cattle fairs in the Presidency.

135 *Q.*—Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) the number of cattle bazaars and fairs held periodically in the Presidency; and

(b) the places where and the days of the week when these bazaars are held?

A.—(a) & (b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the list of weekly cattle fairs held in the several districts of the Presidency, printed at pages 134–137 of the Villagers' Calendar, 1932, a copy of which is available in the Legislative Council Library. Reference may also be made to Table XIV appended to the Administration Report of the Civil Veterinary Department for the year 1930–31.

Cattle breeding operations conducted by District Boards.

136 *Q.*—Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) the number of district boards which at present conduct cattle breeding operations;

---

[a] Printed as Appendix III on page 413 infra.

5th August 1932]

(b) the average yearly expenditure incurred by them on the said operations; and

(c) the number of bulls maintained by them every year for breeding purposes?

A.—(a) No District Board is conducting regular cattle breeding operations. But some District Boards maintain stud bulls for the purpose of improving the local breed and let them out for hire.

(b) Does not arise.

(c)

District Board,	Chingleput	5
,,	Madura	2
,,	Coimbatore	18
,,	Salem	4

The bulls are kept for stud purposes.

Prevention of the spread of cattle diseases from adjoining States.

137 Q.—MR. K. SINGAM AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state whether the Government are considering the methods of preventing contagious diseases of cattle from spreading into this Presidency from adjoining Indian States and if so, what they are?

A.—There is no such proposal at present under the consideration of Government. The existing arrangements for despatch of intimation about prevalence of rinderpest to and from adjoining Indian States are described in paragraphs 152 and 132 of the Civil Veterinary Manual—copy[*] appended.

Education

Efficiency bar in the scale of pay of School Assistants and Deputy Inspectors.

138 Q.—MR. P. BAYAPPA REDDI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) how many School Assistants and Deputy Inspectors are now at Rs. 150 in the scale of Rs. 75—5—100—10—150—10—250 grade and for how many years each; and

(b) whether the hon. the Minister has considered the advisability of removing the bar at Rs. 150 which operates only in the case of the School Assistants and Deputy Inspectors?

A.—(a) The scale of pay for this cadre is Rs. 75—5—100—10—150 with a selection grade on Rs. 150—10—250 for 25 per cent of the cadre. The existence of a selection grade is not peculiar to this particular cadre; many other branches of the public service have selection grades.

The hon. Member is referred to the Quarterly List of officers in the Education Department (Non-Gazetted) (corrected up to 1st January 1932) for particulars regarding the pay, etc., of individual officers.

(b) No.

---

[*] Printed as Appendix IV on page 414 infra.

[5th August 1932

Industries

Work done by the Ceramic Expert.

139 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether a Ceramic Expert has been employed, and if so, when, and for what purpose;

(*b*) the districts visited by him so far and those in which he has completed his work;

(*c*) whether he has published an account of his work and of the possibilities of a ceramic industry, as he visited each district, as the Special Officer for the survey of cottage industries did on a previous occasion, and if not, why not; and

(*d*) whether any instructions were issued from time to time to the Ceramic Expert as regards the lines of investigation to be carried on by him, and if so, how often and what they were?

A.—(*a*) A Ceramic Expert has been working in the Department of Industries since the 9th July 1930. The appointment was sanctioned for conducting a survey of raw materials available for use in the ceramic industry, the extent of their deposits and their commercial value and the facilities available for quarrying and transporting them. The Expert was also directed to investigate the present position and potentialities of the tile industry on the west coast and the problems, if any, with which the tile factories were confronted.

(*b*) The Ceramic Expert has surveyed all the districts in the Presidency except Chittoor, Guntur and the Nilgiri districts.

(*c*) The Expert has been submitting to the Director of Industries preliminary reports on the survey of each district as soon as completed. It has, however, not been found possible for him to include in these reports a final opinion as to the possibility of the industry in the several districts, as this depends on several factors in addition to the presence of raw materials. In order to determine the varieties of the different raw materials, experiments are carried out at the Laboratory and the Experimental Ceramic Kiln at Washermanpet. A complete report embodying these particulars will be prepared by the Expert and submitted to Government on the completion of the survey and experimental work incidental thereto.

(*d*) The programme of work outlined for the Expert was, firstly, to ascertain the localities where the ceramic deposits are known to occur, to examine the raw materials and to determine the extent of the deposits by

means of trial pits and borings. His next business was to collect the samples of the raw materials which appeared suitable for the ceramic industry and to send them to Madras for preliminary investigations such as the following:—

(1) to investigate the plasticity, contraction (wet to dry, dry state to the fired), porosity, colour after firing, study of the fracture, etc., with a view to find out whether the raw material could be used in the manufacture of ceramic goods;
(2) to see if the clay mixture works well on a potter's wheel for preparing jars and other articles usually made on the potter's wheel;
(3) to see if the clay is suitable for pressing in moulds;
(4) to see if the clay mixture could be used for casting hollow articles like tea pots, cups and the like;
(5) to study the effect of temperature on various clays and clay mixtures; and
(6) to build up a body and glaze to match it.

STARRED QUESTIONS

Education

Expenditure on elementary education in Tindivanam, Tirukkoyilur and Chidambaram taluks.

* 140 *Q.*—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the total amount of grant made by the Government to the taluk boards of Tindivanam, Tirukkoyilur and Chidambaram is for elementary education during each of the last five years;

(*b*) what the total amount of expenditure on elementary education by the said taluk boards is in each of the last five years;

(*c*) what the amount of grant made by Government is to each of the said taluk boards for Muslim education during the last five years;

(*d*) what the total amount spent by each of the taluk boards on Muslim education alone is in each of the last five years; and

(*e*) if the information is not with the Government whether the same will be called for and placed on the table ?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The information required is given in the statement [a] appended.

(*c*) The subsidies sanctioned for the opening of new Muhammadan schools during the last five years are shown in the appended statement [a]. The Government have no information as to the amount spent by the taluk boards

[a] Printed as Appendix V on pages 415–416 infra.

[5th August 1932

on Muslim schools from the statutory contribution paid under the proviso to section 37 of the Madras Elementary Education Act, 1920.

(*d*) & (*e*) The Government have no information and do not propose to call for the particulars from the taluk boards.

Excise

Excise Sub-Inspectors.

* 141 *Q.*—Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the 41 candidates selected for the Excise Department as Sub-Inspectors during December last were intended to be employed during 1932;

(*b*) how many of them have been appointed so far;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that a period of training precedes that of appointment; and

(*d*) whether it is a fact that candidates so trained are sent home to wait for their chances of appointment?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*d*) *The Government have no information.* A report has been called for.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Will the hon. Minister call for the information and make it available to us?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"A report has been called for."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Will it be placed on the table of the House?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"After it is received, the hon. Member's suggestion will be considered."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Are the appointments made from the candidates selected every year or from the list of candidates already selected in the previous year and awaiting employment? What is the object of selection every year?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"It is a general question which I cannot answer without notice. It affects all services."

Medical Administration

Transfer of the District Medical Officer of South Kanara.

* 142 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Mr. Ganapathi Ayyar, the District Medical Officer of South Kanara, has been ordered to be transferred within about six months of his transfer to Mangalore;

5th August 1932]

(b) whether it is a fact that Dr. Theyyunni Menon has been ordered to be transferred from Anantapur to Mangalore within about a year of his stay in Anantapur and whether prior to his transfer to Anantapur he was for a long time in Tellicherry;

(c) what is the total travelling allowance and other allowances involved in these two transfers; and

(d) what is the necessity for such short transfers?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) The amount of travelling and other allowances drawn by M.R.Ry. R. Ganapathi Ayyar Avargal, L.M.S., is Rs. 231–10–0. No allowance was drawn by M.R.Ry. K. G. Theyyunni Menon Avargal, L.M.S.

(d) M.R.Ry. R. Ganapathi Ayyar Avargal, L.M.S., was transferred as Lieut. T. J. Gibson, I.M.D., Resident Medical Officer, General Hospital, Madras, applied for a transfer to a district charge and the latter was considered more suitable for such a charge than for the appointment of Resident Medical Officer. M.R.Ry. K. G. Theyyunni Menon Avargal, L.M.S., was transferred as he applied for a transfer to the West Coast and he was willing to forego travelling allowance for the transfer.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—" May I know whether it is not a fact that Dr. Theyyunni Menon was in Tellicherry till the end of last year? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" Notice, Sir."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—" My question in clause (b) is: whether it is a fact that Dr. Theyyunni Menon has been ordered to be transferred from Anantapur to Mangalore within about a year of his stay in Anantapur and whether prior to his transfer to Anantapur he was for a long time in Tellicherry. That question has not been answered? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" The answer is there, Sir, ' Yes '."

Alleged misconduct of Dr. Oomen.

* 143 Q.—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the enquiry held by Major Bal into the allegations of misconduct on the part of Dr. Oomen has been completed; if so, whether the hon. Minister will be pleased to place a copy of the report of the investigating officer on the table of the House; and

(b) what action the Government have taken on the same?

A.—(a) Yes. The report is treated as confidential and cannot therefore be placed on the table.

(b) It is under the consideration of the Government.

[5th August 1932

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether the allegations have been found to be well-founded?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"The report about the allegations is being considered, Sir."

Electricity

Estimate for supplying electric lights to Mettupalaiyam and Karamadai.

* 144 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the cost of supplying electric lights to Mettupalaiyam and Karamadai in Coimbatore district has been estimated;

(*b*) whether the works have been given on contract to anybody and if so, to whom; and

(*c*) whether tenders had been called for and if not, what the reasons are for such a procedure?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Part of the work amounting to Rs. 56,000 has been given on contract to the General Electric Company who are also contractors for the Coimbatore Distribution Works.

(*c*) No. This was considered as a supplementary work to the main work in and round Coimbatore and the economical procedure in such cases is to give the work to the main contractors at contract rates less a percentage rebate to make up for their savings in overhead charges. This has been done in this case.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"May I know whether it is not a fact that in the case of the Coimbatore Distribution Works, the cost is met by the municipality, whereas in the case of Mettupalaiyam and Karamadai, the cost is borne by the Government?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"My hon. Friend's information is not correct. The Government do the work within the municipal limits as the agents of the municipality."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"With reference to the answer to clause (*c*), may I ask what the Government means when saying that the work in Mettupalaiyam and Karamadi is supplementary?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"The main works are in Coimbatore, and Mettupalaiyam and Karamadai are connected with that main work."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Am I to understand that it is part of the same scheme?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Only the main work is in the Coimbatore town and the other work is in a rural area."

5th August 1932].

Mr. A. B. SHETTY :—" May I know whether the procedure adopted in this case is not opposed to the rules regarding the calling of tenders? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The general rule is that tenders must be called for. In this particular case, it is in the interests of everybody that it was given to the principal contractor."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Was it given with the previous consent of the Government, or was the matter subsequently ratified by the Government? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The Government subsequently ratified the Chief Engineer's action. He has discretion in the matter."

Law and Order—General

Alleged beating of certain picketers in Bezwada on 10th June 1932.

* 145 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that on 10th June 1932 Mr. Challaswami Narayanamurthi and Surapaneni Gopalakrishnayya picketed the foreign cloth shop of Manikondu Narasimham and Majeti Subbayya in Bezwada;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that in spite of the Government Order, dated 15th January 1932, complaints have been received by Government of individual picketers who are less than five in number being beaten by the police; and

(*c*) whether it is a fact that the picketers referred to in (*a*) were subsequently admitted into the Peoples' Hospital for treatment; if so, whether the hon. the Home Member will be pleased to call for a statement from the Medical Officer in charge of the hospital showing the number and nature of injuries received and place the same on the table of the House?

A.—(*a*) Challaswami Narayanamurthi, Surapaneni Gopalakrishnayya and three others picketed the foreign cloth shops in the bazaar in Bezwada on 10th June 1932.

(*b*) Allegations have been made in some instances and have been investigated.

(*c*) The Government have no information, but will enquire.

Lathi charges in Bezwada between 6th January 1932 *to 4th July* 1932.

* 146 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many lathi charges or cane charges have there been in Bezwada from 6th January 1932 to 4th July 1932;

(*b*) what the number of persons injured in each charge is and what the nature of their injuries is; and

(c) what the circumstances were under which they were made and the necessity for the same?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The Government have not complete information on all the details required. A memorial on the subject of Police action in Bezwada is under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—" May I know what action the Government has taken on the memorial from the people of Bezwada? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—" The memorial is under the consideration of Government."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" The answer is that the Government have not complete information. What do they mean by it? Do they mean to make further enquiries? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—" Yes, we make enquiries, and on enquiry if it is found that the Police were in the wrong, disciplinary action will be taken."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—" May I know whether any evidence will be adduced in the enquiry to be held? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—" It is not possible for me to say anything in the matter. But I shall consider the suggestion of the hon. Member."

Alleged beating on 13th April 1932 of volunteers by the Police in Bezwada.

* 147 Q.—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that on 13th April 1932, the 'Jallianwalabhag Day', two batches of eight volunteers each went out in procession in Bezwada and the Police beat them severely with lathis;

(b) whether it is a fact that one of the said volunteers Banka Yedukondalu, even after he fell down unconscious after the beating, was three times raised up and beaten by the sergeants again and again and that his left leg was fractured;

(c) whether it is a fact that another of the said volunteers, Mr. Yanduri Veeraraghavaya, was beaten on his testicles on that day; and

(d) whether it is a fact that Mr. Kambampati Venkateswara Rao, another of the said volunteers, was lifted up even after he fell unconscious and beaten by the sergeants and was severely injured under his left eye?

A.—(a) to (d) The Government have no information and they have no reason to suppose that the volunteers mentioned were beaten in the manner indicated. Nor are they aware of any complaints of ill-treatment preferred by these persons at the time of alleged occurrence.

5th August 1932].

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I ask whether the Government will call for the necessary information in this case? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— " Yes, Sir."

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—" May I know why the Government say that there is no reason to suppose that the Police would not have behaved otherwise? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— " Because, nothing of the kind was brought to our notice."

Alleged beating of Messrs. D. Subbayya and Nabi Sahib at Bapatla on 11th April 1932.

* 148 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that two persons Dassari Subbayya and Nabi Sahib were subjected to a severe lathi charge by the Police of Bapatla on 11th April 1932, after they were taken by the Police into their custody near the Sub-Court;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that the said two persons were beaten by eight constables with lathis and casuarina sticks simultaneously;

(*c*) whether the Government have perused the statement of an advocate who was an eye-witness of the same; and

(*d*) what action have the Government taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The facts reported are as follows:—

One Nabi Sahib and his companion tried to enter the Sub-Court, Bapatla, on 11th April 1932 to create a scene. They were promptly turned out. An excited crowd which followed them was ordered by the Sub-Inspector to disperse and on its refusal to do so was dispersed by a cane charge. It is not true that the two persons mentioned in the question were beaten with lathis or casuarina sticks as alleged.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) The incident was the subject-matter of a criminal complaint in the Court of the Joint Magistrate, Ongole, who dismissed the complaint under section 203, Criminal Procedure Code. The Government do not propose to take any action in the matter.

Alleged forcible dispersal of a Congress procession at Mangalore on 13th April 1932.

* 149 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that there was a peaceful Congress procession on 13th April 1932 in Mangalore town of about 40 Congress volunteers including ladies;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Police severely beat them with lathis and canes;

(c) whether it is a fact that when they refused to disperse in spite of the severe beating they were all arrested and taken to the Police station;

(d) whether it is a fact that they were admitted into the Wenlock Hospital, Mangalore, for treatment; if so, whether the hon. the Home Member will be pleased to place a copy of the Accident Register or a statement of the District Medical Officer, regarding the number and nature of the injuries received by each of them; and

(e) what is the number of the Police that were utilized to beat and disperse the said procession?

A.—(a) to (c) On 13th April 1932 a procession about 35 strong, including five or six women, started to go round the town. It was stopped by the Police and the women were separated. The rest of the processionists were given due warning to disperse and, on their refusal, two cane charges were made. All the processionists were then arrested and taken to the Police station. With the exception of the leaders, the remainder were later released.

(d) & (e) The Government have no information, but will enquire.

Alleged arrest and detention of picketers in the lock-up at Mangalore.

* 150 Q.—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that picketers in Mangalore are arrested in the evening since the beginning of this month, taken to the lock-up and detained in the night and let off next morning at about 9 a.m.; and

(b) if so, whether it is a fact that they are not really supplied with any food, though the Station House Officer daily makes a bill for their feeding charges?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have no information but have called for it.

Alleged cruelty to picketers arrested in Mangalore.

* 151 Q.—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that in Mangalore since the beginning of July picketers are arrested and kept in the lock-up during the nights and released next morning at about 9 a.m.;

(b) whether just before they are put in, the floor of the lock-up is watered profusely;

(c) whether all the clothes of the picketers are removed by the Police except a small loin cloth;

(d) whether it is a fact that they are not given any food at night;

(e) whether it is a fact that they are not given any clothes or mats to lie upon but are made to lie on the wet floor without any clothes, starving and half-naked; and

(f) what action have the Government taken or propose to take in the matter ?

A.—(a) *to* (f) Government have no information but have called for it.

Law and Order—General.

Lathi charge by the Police at Tanuku on 24th July 1932.

* 152 *Q.*—Mr. C. INDRIAH: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether there was a lathi charge at Tanuku in the district of West Godavari on the 24th of July at 6 a.m.;

(b) whether it is a fact that Mr. Tallapragada Narayanamurti and others were mercilessly beaten;

(c) whether it is a fact that Mr. Tallapragada Narayanamurti received serious injuries on his head;

(d) whether it is a fact that the said Mr. T. Narayanamurti was removed to the local Government hospital for treatment; and

(e) whether it is a fact that one of his eyes was swollen as a result of the injuries received by him?

A.—(a) *to* (e) The facts as reported by the District Magistrate are as follows:—

An attempt was made to hold a conference at Tanuku on 24th morning in support of civil disobedience. The Police had previous intimation and obtained orders under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, on the previous day prohibiting all meetings and other Congress activities. At about 5 a.m. on 24th morning a batch of fourteen volunteers including one woman was found moving from the Canal bund towards the Town Hall carrying flags, leaflets, etc., and singing songs. The volunteers were warned by the Police to disperse, but, as they failed to do so, were dispersed by force. The leader, Tallapragada Narayanamurti, was arrested. Government have no information as to the nature of any injuries he may have received or as to the medical treatment given him.

Mr. C. INDRIAH:—" May I request the hon. the Home Member to call for information regarding the injuries inflicted according to the report of the medical people? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—" The suggestion of the hon. Member will be considered."

[5th August 1932

Lathi charge by the Police at Bhimavaram on the 24th July 1932.

* 153 *Q.*—Mr. C. INDRIAH: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that there was a lathi charge at Bhimavaram on the 24th of July 1932 at 6 a.m.;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that Mr. Tallapragada Prakasa Rayudu, M.A., and others were mercilessly beaten;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that Mr. T. Prakasa Rayudu, M.A., received serious injuries on his head and hands;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that one of his hands was seriously injured; and

(*e*) whether it is a fact that he was removed to the local Government hospital for treatment?

A.—(*a*) to (*e*) The facts as reported by the District Magistrate are as follows:—

On the morning of 24th July 1932 at about 5 a.m. a party of some twenty Congress volunteers including two women were proceeding towards the chowk at Bhimavaram with a view to hold a taluk conference in support of civil disobedience. As the volunteers would not disperse after due warning, the Police dispersed them by a mild lathi charge. Three volunteers including the leader, Kasturi Prakasa Rayudu, received slight injuries, and Prakasa Rayudu was arrested. No more force than was necessary for the dispersal of the volunteers was used. Government have no information as to what medical treatment was given to Prakasa Rayudu.

Mr. C. INDRIAH:—"The report of the District Magistrate does not say anything about the parts of the body on which injuries were inflicted. Will the hon. the Home Member call for information as to the injuries received by Mr. Prakasa Rayudu on the head and hands?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Yes, Sir."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Before the District Magistrate made his report, did he enquire Mr. Prakasa Rayudu about the alleged injuries received by him?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I have no information on that point."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Is it all an one-sided report then?"

Acquittal of Mr. Somayajulu, Secretary, Buy Indian League, Narasapur.

* 154 *Q.*—Mr. C. INDRIAH: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government are aware of the fact that Mr. P. V. Somayajulu, Secretary of the Buy Indian League, Narasapur, West

Godavari district, was acquitted in the criminal case launched against him; and

(b) if so, what action the Government are going to take against the Police officials who are responsible for launching the prosecution against him?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The Government have not yet examined the records of the case.

Mr. C. INDRIAH:—" May I request the hon. the Home Member to state whether any appeal has been preferred against the acquittal? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—" Notice, Sir."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" Do the Government propose to examine the records of the case and then take any necessary action in the matter? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—" Yes, Sir. The question will be considered."

Police

Alleged oppression of the Depressed Classes of the Devakottai subdivision.

* 155 Q.—Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) with regard to the allegations of oppression of the depressed classes in the Devakottai subdivision, what steps have been taken to mitigate such oppression;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Joint Magistrate of the subdivision is apathetic towards the depressed classes; and

(c) if the necessary information is not available, whether the Government will gather the information and place it on the table of the House?

A.—(a) The District Officers of Ramnad have taken such steps as are necessary to prevent breaches of the peace; a full report has been called for from the District Magistrate and the Labour Commissioner will shortly visit the area.

(b) The Government have no information to this effect.

(c) The Government have already called for information and will in due course make known the results of the enquiries made.

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—" With reference to the answer to clause (a), may I know what the source of information for the Government is? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—" We have received a report from the District Magistrate that some of the allegations were exaggerated. But Government were

not satisfied with that report. Therefore, they have called for further information. Further, Sir, some hon. Members representing the depressed classes have made representations to me that something should be done in order to prevent a recurrence of such incidents. Therefore, I am convening this afternoon a conference of some hon. Members representing the depressed classes, such as Swami Sahajanandam, Mr. Srinivasan, Mr. Muniswami Pillai and Diwan Bahadur Arogyaswami Mudaliyar to meet the Commissioner of Labour and myself to discuss the question from the point of view of the hon. Members. The Commissioner of Labour will visit the place and make such enquiries as are necessary about the whole affair and submit a report to the Government, in order to take effective steps to prevent a recurrence of the trouble."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Why, in this case only, the Government are not satisfied with the report of the District Magistrate?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Because it did not contain full information. That is why we have called for further information."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know the nature of the report received from the Collector?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"He said he went to the place and found on enquiry that the allegations were exaggerated. As I wanted a full report, I have called for it."

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—"May I know, Sir, if the Government did not receive reports about such incidents in the past?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"We have received reports from the District Magistrate in the past. There was no trouble for some time, but only in July last there has been a recrudescence."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I take it that the Government will give an opportunity to members of the depressed classes to give their own version of the case."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"As a matter of fact, the hon. Members representing the depressed classes are going to give their own version of the case to the conference."

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—"May I know, Sir, whether an enquiry was made of the members of the depressed classes into the wrongs alleged and what the Government did with the resolution passed by this House?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"As I said, this is a situation which should be handled very delicately. The feeling between the Kallars and the Depressed Classes is running high. It is alleged that the missionaries are

5th August 1932]

taking sides with the Depressed Classes as against the Kallars. Therefore, the situation has to be handled very carefully. I have impressed this fact upon the District Officers. There was no trouble for sometime until July last. I am prepared now to send the Labour Commissioner to see that cordial relationship is brought about between the two communities."

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—" Is it not a fact that the Police are joining the side of the Kallars in this affair?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— " I have no information. I do not think it is the business of the Police to take sides. I shall ask Mr. Souter to enquire on the specific point."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Considering the fact that this is not the first time but one of a series of troubles we have had in that district of Ramnad and considering the fact that last year this Council passed a resolution that a committee should be appointed and that Government declined to appoint a committee, may I ask what steps the Government have taken to prevent a recrudescence of the trouble, now that it has happened again in a serious form? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— " As a matter of fact, the attention of the District Magistrate was drawn to the debate held here on the subject, and it was suggested that he should use his influence to see that these things did not recur. As far as I could see, there was no trouble till about July last. I am now asking the Labour Commissioner to make an enquiry and to go into the root cause of the trouble and to see what could be done in order to promote harmony between the two communities."

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—STATEMENT REGARDING THE HEALTH OF MR. SUBASH CHANDRA BOSE (A STATE PRISONER).

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—" Mr. President, yesterday, I gave notice of two short-notice questions concerning the health of Mr. Subash Chandra Bose. In view of the fact that notice was not waived by the hon. the Law Member and in view of the fact that the matter is very important and urgent, I request you to see that information is given to us regarding the health of the prisoner."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" As my hon. Friend stated, Sir, he gave me a short-notice question yesterday afternoon regarding certain particulars concerning Mr. Subash Chandra Bose. I said that I could not waive notice, and give the answer to-day. Mr. Subash Chandra Bose about whom my hon. Friend wants information, I may state, he is not our prisoner. He is not a prisoner who has

been convicted or who has been kept as a State prisoner by this Government. He is a prisoner of State kept in our custody by the Government of India.

11-30 a.m. "He was formerly kept in custody by the Government of India in one of the jails in the Central Provinces. The Government of India sent Mr. Subash Chandra Bose to this Government with a view to have him examined by an X-Ray apparatus, apparently for the reason that in the particular jail in the Central Provinces where he was confined they have no X-Ray apparatus. I may assure my Friend and the House generally that after he was brought to Madras he has not become worse than when he was sent from that prison. The best possible attention is being paid to him and the utmost care is being taken of his health by the medical authorities here. Seeing that he is a State prisoner, and seeing that he has been sent by the Government of India with instructions to this Government to keep him in the Penitentiary, according to the standing instructions of the Government of India regulating matters like this, this Government is not in a position to divulge the contents of the correspondence that is now going on between the local Government and the Government of India regarding Mr. Subash Chandra Bose. I may state this however, namely, that the correspondence now going on between the Central Government and this Government is in the interests of Mr. Subash Chandra Bose. As I said, every possible attention is being paid to his health and every possible care is being taken of him, and he is not worse than when he arrived here." (Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan: 'Not better.')

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Let me express the gratefulness of the House for the very detailed statement of the hon. the Law Member, though at one time he did not allow the question to be answered with short notice. I think he has given all that is required in answer to that question. But what is wanted now by the friends of Mr. Bose or those who are interested in his health is not the removal of that person from this Presidency or this jail, but having regard to the health of that person and having regard also to the fact that he has lost as much as 42 lbs. in weight, whether it would not be possible for the Government to confine him in one of the wards of the General Hospital, so that he may not be compelled to go there for treatment every time he is required by the medical authorities. That is what we require, and nothing more. I suppose that Mr. Bose could be kept as a prisoner even in the General Hospital by giving him a room and keeping him under Police vigilance as is done in the case of our own prisoners."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"As regards the last question of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar, I may tell him that the correspondence now going on between this Government and the Government of India consists of telegraphic correspondence and written correspondence. As soon as the final opinions of the Government of India are received in this matter, their wishes will be carried out."

III.—STATEMENT REGARDING THE ALLEGED OPPRESSION OF THE DEPRESSED CLASSES IN THE DEVAKOTTAI SUBDIVISION.

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I have given notice of a motion of adjournment, but my Friend the hon. the Home Member has just told us in answer to a supplementary question to the last question that he is convening a conference of some members of this Council and the Labour Commissioner, so that we might discuss the steps that might be taken to secure the prevention of the recrudescence of similar troubles. Well, Sir, we have to be thankful for small mercies even, and I am grateful to the hon the Home Member for his assurances. But I must say that it is with a certain amount of reluctance that I do not propose to press the motion for adjournment. This is not the first time we are having this trouble. The trouble occurred last year. This House passed a resolution to appoint a committee of enquiry, which the Government declined to accept and we thought from the assurances of Government given then that the trouble will not occur again. But it has occurred again and in a very severe form. I only hope that the steps we are now going to take will be more effective than the steps taken last year, and such trouble will not occur again."

IV.—ALLEGED DELAY IN ANSWERING QUESTIONS PUT TO GOVERNMENT.

* Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" Mr. President, Sir, I wish to bring to your notice the way in which the House is being treated by the Government in respect of certain questions put to them. You may remember, Sir, that on the 24th March last, several questions were not auswered on the ground that Government have not had enough time to furnish the answers, and the hon. the Home Member on that occasion suggested that if those questions were repeated, answers would be provided. Accordingly, I repeated some of these questions, questions 181,185 and 186 and notices of these were sent to the Council office on 16th July 1932, but they have not been answered, though four months have now elapsed. I seek your protection, Sir, as the custodian of the privileges of this House, to see that these questions are answered without any further unnecessary delay."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" As far as I am informed, the Government asked for extension of time and the extension of time has perhaps been given. I do not quite remember it. If the hon. Member had only asked me or given previous intimation to me, I would have made further enquiries. Anyhow the Government will be reminded to furnish speedy answers to these questions, if old."

V.—THE ORISSA COMMITTEE REPORT—ELUCIDATION OF CERTAIN INCIDENTS THAT OCCURRED ON PREVIOUS DAY AT DIVISION TIME.

Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo :—" I rise to make a statement on the floor of the House with regard to the demand for poll I made last evening in connexion with the amendment of the Raja of Bobbili regarding the Orissa question. My seat is in a corner and at the farthest end of the House, and very likely the President might not

have heard me. I was told that Dr. Subbarayan also reminded the Chair that I wanted a division. Of course the resolution would not be supported by several Members because . . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Order, order. The hon. Gentleman is not entitled to make a further speech on the Orissa question. I would explain the matter as it took place yesterday. I did not see the hon. Member from Ganjam alert enough in asking for a poll, and after I sat down, I looked at him especially when Dr. Subbarayan, the Leader of the Opposition, told me that Mr. Patnaik was asking for a poll. But when I looked at the hon. Member, he was busy talking to some other hon. Member. Therefore I thought that he was not serious about asking for a poll. That is all I can say about that matter."

NON-OFFICIAL BUSINESS.

BILL.

VI. THE TIRUMALAI-TIRUPATI DEVASTHANAMS BILL.

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Mr. President, I beg to move that, in the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill, clause 36 be reopened for discussion."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I think the House is agreeable to the reopening of the clause 36 as agreed upon the other day."

The House signified its assent.

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" I move—

> '*that in clause* 36 (*vi*) add *at the end the following words*: " *and the training of Adhyapakas and Vedaparayanikas* ".'

" I made myself clear during the second reading of the Bill that a certain service which consists in the reciting of *Nalayira prapandams* and *Vedams* by a Ghoshti has got to be maintained in every *Vaishnavite* temple, but of late, for want of support, that *Ghoshti* is languishing and it is desirable that that institution should be kept up. So long as we are making provision for the utilization of surplus funds, it seems to me desirable, consistent with the objects for which the other provisions have been made, to devote some money for the training of persons for the purpose of chanting the *Nalayira Prapandam* and *Vedas*. These two services are included in these two words '*Adhyapakas* and *Vedaparayanikas*.' I therefore move this amendment."

Rao Bahadur T. M. NARAYANASWAMI PILLAI:—" I second it."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" I have no objection to the suggestion of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. But to one who would read the section it would give the impression that we are trying to enumerate exhaustively, the various persons to whom such training is to be afforded at the cost of the Devasthanam. I do not think even the Mover of this amendment does contemplate that between the archakas and the two sets of persons he has mentioned the list of all persons engaged in religious worship and ceremonies of the Devasthanam, is exhausted. I would therefore suggest that the clause would be all the better and at

5th August 1932] [Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar]

the same time serve the purpose of the Mover of this amendment if instead of the word ' archakas ' we substitute the word ' persons ' which term, without in the least degree trying to be exhaustive will mean all persons who are engaged in the performance of religious worship and ceremonies. I think, therefore, in the interests of the draftmanship of the Bill, if the term ' persons ' be substituted for ' archakas ' this amendment would become unnecessary.

" I move my amendment."

* Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" Mr. President, I am glad that my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar, does not object to the object of my amendment, but as a matter of better draftsmanship he would suggest the word ' persons ' be substituted for ' archakas.' I am afraid that while he agrees with me with regard to the object of my amendment he is making some confusion with regard to the ceremonies performed in the Devasthanam and ceremonies performed outside it. I quite agree that if the persons I have in view were in the category of persons who are attached to the temple and have got to perform ceremonies and worship in the temple, it is unnecessary for me to move this amendment. But I have in mind a set of persons who are not obliged to do service in the temple, nor does it form part of the worship and ceremonies in the Devasthanam. It is a service which is rendered while procession of the idol moves on and only a particular set of people can join in it and recite those particular *slokams* and *sthothrams*. They do 11-45 not belong to the regular category of servants of the Devasthanams, a.m. nor are they paid servants of the temple who are called Ghoshti. That Ghoshti may consist of persons who do not belong to the service of the temple but who are in a position to recite these Vedams and Nalayira Prapandams. It is exactly for the reason that they do not belong to the service of the temple that much encouragement is not given to them by the temple authorities. It is upon the public support that they are living now. Nowadays that public support is not coming forward. It is to make up that want of support from the public and also to see that persons should be trained in that particular service I want to move this amendment. I use the word ' service ' not in the sense of paid-service where the servants are bound to perform the service allotted to them, but in the sense that every human being is willing to place his services before God. I suppose I have made myself clear to my hon. Friend, Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar, and even at the risk of had draftsmanship I would request him to allow this amendment to go forth."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar :—" I move that in the amendment given notice of by Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, the words ' maintaining a Ghoshti ' be omitted."

* Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" I myself omitted them when I moved my amendment."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar :—" I accept the amendment."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is—

'*that in clause* 36 (*vi*) add *at the end the following words*: "*and the training of Adhyapakas and Vedaparayanikas*" '."

The amendment was carried.

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—" I now move—

'*that Bill No.* 15 *of* 1931, *as amended, be passed into law* '."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I beg to second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The motion is—

'*that Bill No.* 15, *as amended, be passed into law* '."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" Mr. President, on behalf of those who are sitting on this side of the House (A voice: 'Not all.') I have very great pleasure to thank those hon. Gentlemen who gave notice of several Bills in respect of the management of Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams. Ultimately it fell to the fortunate lot of my hon. Friend Mr. C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar to shoulder the responsibility of piloting this Bill and I have no doubt that he will concede to the Members of the Select Committee their due share of work in shaping this Bill in the form in which it is now to become law. The Bill as originally introduced in this Council provided for the complete removal of the Mahant from the management of this Estate and vested large powers in an executive officer subject to the superintendence and control of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board. I have no doubt that the main motive of that Bill was to divest the Mahant from the control and management of the Devasthanams and its properties. Beyond that, it must be said that it did not go on liberal lines. While trying to transfer a single man's power from one person, the Bill contemplated to place the whole power again in the hands of another in the person of an executive officer subject to the control of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board. In conformity with the times and with the ideas of representative Government, the Select Committee could not tolerate that one particular individual autocrat should be replaced by another. Therefore, the Select Committee placed the management of this Devasthanam and its endowments in a Committee which would compose of persons elected by the Hindu hon. Members of this Legislative Council. It is on this point a good deal of controversy arose in this Council and I am afraid that the attitude of hon. Members who misunderstood the object of confining the election to the Hindu Members of this Council as having been an attempt to create a communal electorate is thoroughly unjustified. As has been explained by the hon. Member, Mr. Raman Menon, the original idea was that the Hindu Devasthanams must be managed by persons elected by those who have an interest in the Devasthanams and it is a natural law that particular institutions should be managed by those persons who have an interest in those institutions. Therefore, Sir, in order that that electorate might be manageable, it was decided that the electorate should be confined to the Hindu Members of this Council. I do not think

5th August 1932] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti]

there is in anything which we did a conflict with our opiuions iu regard to the joint electorate or the communal electorate. Of course hon. Members like Mr. Pannirselvam and others might willingly misunderstand us and try to fling an argument or two against us but he himself would realize that in institutions like this those people who have got an interest have to take a share in the matter of election, but with regard to the general administration of the country, Hindus, Muhammadans and Christians have an identity of interests. Therefore, it is that we want a general electorate. In regard to Hindu institutions I cannot conceive of any interest of Muhammadans or Christians coming in.

" Apart from that, coming to the powers of the committee that are provided in the Bill, it seems to me that they are consistent with a controlling committee. The committee is not however allowed to interfere with the detailed administration of the Devasthanams. It can lay down policy and exercise a general superintendence and control over the acts of the executive officer. It can prevent mismanagement and rectify defects in the institutions. In several ways it can safeguard the interests of the Devasthanams. It would be unwise to vest a committee of that sort with more powers. In local bodies and similar self-governing institutions, we have come to realize that it would conduce to efficiency if the actual detailed administration was left in the hands of au executive officer instead of in the hands of unwieldy councils and committees. This Bill has wisely taken note of that fact and provided for the appointment of an executive officer to attend to the detailed administration of the Devasthanams. But I should like that the officer should be one in the active service of the Government and not a retired officer or a private person. At one time all of us were agreed on that principle but gradually one after another was converted to the new creed. And they all began to argue with the zeal of a new convert. I hope that, from whatever cadre the executive officer is recruited, he will discharge his duties honestly and efficiently so that any suspicion that may exist against officers not belonging to the active service of the Government may be falsified.

12 noon.

" Then with regard to the utilization of the surplus fnnds of the Devasthanam, I am afraid the very wise suggestion of the hon. the Advocate-General was not accepted. It would satisfy many a devout Hindu if he could safely rely that the funds of the Devasthanam would not be applied to purposes not consistent with the objects of the Devathanam. In regard to the institutions governed by the Hindu Religious Endowments Act, the danger does not arise because many of the institutions have no surplus funds. But the Tirupati Devasthanam has got a lot of surplus funds and it is necessary that the Committee appointed by this Government should not be tempted to spend the funds on objects which are not consistent with the objects of the Devasthanam.

" I hope when this Bill becomes law it would remove the complaints and grievances which have become very audible recently and improve the Devasthanam not only financially but also in the atmosphere of piety and holiness associated witb such places.

[Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti] [5th August 1932

"I would be failing in my duty if I did not express, on behalf of the Council, our gratitude to Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar who has rendered a great service as Chairman of the Select Committee. Apart *from the several problems he had to tackle as Chairman*, he had to satisfy some people who were rather impatient and thought that every day's adjournment meant so much further trouble in the Devasthanam. They suspected adjournments much. Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar sacrificed some of his holidays in the summer to sit up and draft the clauses in the Bill embodying the ideas agreed to in the Committee. He evinced such a wonderful tact that the Committee found no difficulty in understanding things quickly and coming to quick decisions. I wish every select committee had a chairman like him. I wish also to refer to the hon. Minister, Mr. Muniswami Nayudu. Though he would not like to commit himself to any particular line in the matter of this Bill, yet his silence was more eloquent to show in what particular manner he would like this question to be tackled. I have no doubt that on the whole he is thoroughly satisfied with the Bill and that most of the sections in it reflect his own opinions. But all this work could not have been done so quickly and so smoothly but for the valuable assistance given to the Committee by our Secretary, Mr. Krishna Ayyar. He was ever ready to help us out of any legal or drafting difficulty. His suggestions were always most acceptable to the Committee. The actual drafting of very many of the sections in the Bill fell to his lot. The clear and concise nature of the Act shows the legal acumen which Mr. Krishna Ayyar possesses in abundance. I should therefore express our gratitude to him for the service he has rendered. Finally the thanks of the Council are also due to the Members of the Select Committee who have brought this task to a successful conclusion."

* Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I rise to support the motion that the Bill be passed into law. It is rather unique that this Bill has been sponsored by hon. Members belonging to different sections of the House. A measure of this kind dealing, as it does, with a great religious institution, will not be effective unless it is able to command the support of large sections of the community. The members of the Select Committee with the help of their able Chairman, Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar have carefully considered this Bill. It is gratifying to find such a degree of unanimity in regard to this measure, in this House. Ever since the late Raja of Panagal, the then Leader of the Justice Party, passed the Hindu Religious Endowments Act though against the strong opposition of certain sections of the people, there has been a healthy change of public opinion in favour of the control of these religious institutions, especially the bigger ones. The Hindu Religious Endowments Act is very useful in regard to the smaller institutions, but in regard to big institutions like the Tirupati Devasthanam with an income of Rs. 15 lakhs a year, it is not possible for the Board to exercise as effective control as is desirable. I do not mean to suggest that the temple was mismanaged or anything of that sort. But everyone interested in the temple would like to be assured that the temple

was managed fairly well. When the Bill was introduced first, the Movers of the Bill were not definite about what powers the Mahant had formerly, what he had now and what he should have in the future. There was some controversy about it in the Select Committee and they have finally decided the question in a satisfactory manner. Some Members wanted that the Mahant should be removed altogether from the administration of the temple, because they said that the Mahant had not managed the temple as well as one would expect. But he has been the head of this institution and it is but fair that he should be associated with the management of the temple. I am glad that the Select Committee have recommended to keep the Mahant as one of the permanent members of the Committee of management. With regard to the Executive Officer again, there was some controversy in the Select Committee as to whether he should be a retired officer or one in the active service of Government. It was said that a retired officer may not conduct himself properly and may not be as responsible to the Committee and the Government as an officer in the active service of Government who would look forward to rejoin his service. But as the Bill lays no such restriction, I hope, whoever be the officer appointed, whether one in active service or a retired officer, an officer or a non-official, that he will conduct himself properly. Especially as it is proposed to pay him a decent salary, it is expected that a person of some reputation and standing will be chosen for this important post.

" The hon. Member from the City of Madras referred to the attitude of my revered leader, the hon. Mr. Muniswami Nayudu on this question. I must say that he has been very fair to all—to the Movers of the Bill, to the Mahant who is the present administrator and to the Hindu Religious Endowments Board. It was generous on the part of the Leader of a Party with such a strength in the Council not to have openly expressed his personal views but patiently waited to hear the opposition. If he said yes or no it would be that and nothing else. (Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti: ' And take the gems from the Opposition.') He was considerate to the Opposition, considerate to one and all. I hope you would admit that the Opposition are not here to waste their time on useless points but to make useful suggestions. The hon. Member from the City, himself made many good suggestions which have found their way into the Bill. Although the hon. the Chief Minister was in favour of the principle of the Bill, he always kept an open mind in the matter. The Bill has been passed so far with a unanimous vote of the House. It is unanimity that is required more than anything else in such matters. With these few words I strongly support the motion to pass this Bill into law."

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro:—" Sir, songs of eulogy and hallelujah have been sung melodiously on both sides of the House. But if I rise to strike a jarring note in the midst of this cheerful atmosphere both on the side of the Opposition and on the side of the Ministerialists it is only with a desire to draw the attention of the House, not as a monitor or critic but as an old Member that a serious matter like this

should not be dealt with in this way of frivolity and levity. I have noticed that speeches have been interrupted with questions and cross-questions and vain hilarity so often that it gives one the impression that we are not at all serious in dealing with this matter.

12-15 p.m. "Pardon me, Sir, if I have to point out as an old Member, that the manner in which the debate has taken place is not at all dignified and satisfactory. I am very sorry to say so, but I am sure it will be accepted and understood in the spirit in which the remarks are offered, not as one of criticism but as one of advice on the manner in which we should transact the business of this House.

"Going into the merits of the Bill, it is very gratifying that this Bill has received the support of all sides of the House. This is not a Bill of the Ministerialists or of the Opposition; but it is a Bill of this House fully supported by both sides. The provisions of this Bill have been very carefully drafted and it gives no room for any further criticism. If we can see the soul of late Sir Subrahmanya Ayyar hovering above, it will be gratifying for him to see that his labours to systematize and regulate the affairs of this Religious Endowment and Devasthanam of Tirumalai have succeeded and that, after so many years, the administration of this temple has been placed on a proper and satisfactory footing. We have had many troubles and so many complaints about the management of these devasthanams and about the utilization of the surplus funds. These complaints have been made for nearly half a century. But I am glad that the management of the affairs regarding the great Devasthanam of Tirumalai and Tirupati have now been placed on a satisfactory footing. A Committee will be appointed not only to look after the secular affairs attached to these temples but also religious affairs, and the utilization of the surplus funds.

"I will draw the attention of the House to a very important point that was raised by the amendment of Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar viz., about the electorates being Hindus, about the Hindus having the right of voting for the election of Members to the Committee . . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I do not think the hon. Member will be justified in provoking a discussion on that point; it has already been discussed and decided upon. It will not be useful at this stage to introduce any further controversy on the point."

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, I bow to your ruling though I do not agree with it. I did not raise this point in any spirit of criticism; but it is a matter of grave importance to this Province where you have got depressed classes who are untouchables in such a large majority and whose interests have to be guarded and safeguarded by this House as the guardian and trustee of the rights of various people in this Province. This House has a right to consider whether or not these depressed classes have the right of taking part in the election of Members to the Committee. The question whether they are Hindus or not must be seriously considered and stated. Therefore I ventured to raise this point. I do not want that this aspect of the question should

5th August 1932] [Sir A. P. Patro]

be lost sight of on this occasion. The question will come up on proper occasions and the House must seriously discuss it and come to right conclusions.

"I shall say, Sir, a few words about the administration of surplus funds. I am glad that the hon. Member from the City made the suggestion; it is a very important point; the performance of the religious ceremonies and the recital of the Vedas and Prabandams are now losing ground; they are not done properly in some temples and they are altogether ignored in others; our ancient religious culture is being very much neglected. I am glad that an addition has been made definitely and specifically with a view to see that the recital of the Vedas and other religious ceremonies are restored to their proper level. If this biggest devasthanam takes a lead in this matter, others are likely to follow. I am glad that a definite provision has been made in this Bill to devote a portion of the surplus funds for the purpose of seeing that the recital of the Vedas and Prabandams is improved."

* Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, I thank Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti and the Chairman of the Select Committee for the help they have given me. It is now my duty to convey my thanks and that of the other Movers of the Bill for the cordial support which all the Members of the Council have given to this Bill. It is now fully 9 months since this Bill was moved in this House and the Select Committee met on 12 days. The Members of the Select Committee have bestowed their best attention for improving this Bill. As all hon. Memhers are aware, this Bill has come out very much improved from its original form and for that, credit is greatly due to Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. I must say that he has been taking greater interest in the Bill than the Movers themselves. I say therefore that our thanks are due not only to the Chairman of the Select Committee but also to Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti for the improved form in which the Bill has been passed finally. It was thought when the Hindu Religious Endowments Act was passed, that it would apply to the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams. But owing to the ingenious interpretation of the Legal Advisers of the Mahant, those devasthanams have escaped the clutches of that Act. It was thought for a long time that a measure of this kind should be introduced to bring those important devasthanams under the provisions of that Act with a view to improve the administration of those temples, and that object has been achieved by this Bill. When the Bill was introduced in this House, there was a considerable section of the public who were criticizing why the Matams of Tiruvaduthurai, Tirupanendal and of Dharmapuram were not touched. I am sure that this Bill is only a fore-runner of other Bills to follow with a view to improve other important institutions which pertain to Saivatism. I am sure this will be done before the life-time of this Council. With these few words I once again thank all the sections of the House for the interest they have evinced in the passing of this measure and also for the support they have given to this Bill. At frequent stages of the Bill it was thought that there would be considerable opposition to this Bill, but all those fears have vanished and the Bill has now come to be passed into an Act."

Swami A. S. SAHAJANANDAM spoke in Tamil:—

" திருமலை-திருப்பதி தேவஸ்தான நிர்வாக விஷயமாக ஓர் பில் கொண்டு வந்து அங்கீகரிக்கச் செய்ததற்காக கனம் முதன் மந்திரி யவர்களுக்கு வணக்கங் கூறுகிறேன்.

" இந்து மதபரிபாலன சட்டம் தோன்றி சுமார் பத்தாண்டுகளாகியும் தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட வகுப்பினர் தேவஸ்தான கம்மிட்டிகளுக்குத் தேர்தலில் நிற்க முடியவில்லை. ஆனால் சென்ற ஆண்டுகளில் டாக்டர் சுப்பராயனவர்கள் இரு அங்கத்தினர்களை நியமனஞ்செய்தார். இப்போது எல்லாக் கமிட்டிகளிலும் நியமனமில்லை. தேர்தலே இருக்கிறது. அதில் ஆதிதிராவிடர்கள் நின்று வரமுடியவில்லை. லோகல் போர்டுகளில் ஸ்தானங்கள் ஒதுக்கிவைத்திருப்பதால் அதில் தாழ்த்தப்பட்டவர்கள் நிற்க முடிகிறது. தற்போது வரப்போகும் சீர்த்திருத்தத்திலும் ஸ்தானங்கள் ஒதுக்கும்படி கேட்கிறோம். அப்படியே தேவஸ்தானக் கமிட்டிகளிலும் இடம் ஒதுக்கிவைக்கவேண்டும். அப்படியே திருப்பதி-திருமலை தேவஸ்தான நிருவாகக் கமிட்டியிலும் ஒரு ஸ்தானம் ஒதுக்கிவைக்கவேண்டும். தேர்தலிலோ அல்லது நியமனத்திலோ ஒரு ஸ்தானம் தாழ்த்தப்பட்டவர்களுக்கு ஒதுக்கவேண்டும். திருப்பதிக்குச் செல்லும் தாழ்த்தப்பட்டவர்களுக்கு வசதி தேடவும், தேவஸ்தான கலாசாலைகளில் தாழ்த்தப்பட்டவர்களுக்கு இடம் கிடைக்கவும் கவனிப்பதற்கு தாழ்த்தப்பட்டவர்களுக்கு என ஒன்றிருக்கவேண்டும். சாதாரணமாக இந்து என்னும் பதமிருப்பது போதாது. தாழ்த்தப்பட்டவர்களுள்பட இந்துக்கள் என்றிருத்தல்வேண்டும். இது விஷயமாக செலெக்ட் கமிட்டியில் ஆனவரைக்கும் வாதஞ்செய்தேன். ஒருநாள் கனம் டாக்டர் சுப்பராயனவர்கள், கனம் ராஜா மிர்ஜாபுரம் முதலானவர் ஆதிதிராவிடர் கள் கமிட்டியிலிருக்கவேண்டுமென்று தீர்மானித்தார்கள். அந்த நடவடிக்கையும் அனைவருக்கும் கொடுக்கப்பட்டது. அதன் மறுநாள் அதனைத் திருத்திவிட்டார்கள். சட்டமிருப்பதுமாத்திரம் போதாது அனுபவத்தில் வரப்பார்த்தலே உசிதம். ஆதலால் தாழ்த்தப்பட்டவர்களை கமிட்டியில் அங்கத்தினராக்கவேண்டியவாறு திருத்தவேண்டுகிறேன்."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" The question is—

'*that the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill, as amended, be passed into law*'."

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

VII.—RESOLUTIONS ON MATTERS OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

SERVICE OF COPYISTS AND COPYIST-EXAMINERS IN THE REVENUE COURTS.

12-30 p.m. * The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Discussion on Mr. Hameed Khan's resolution [a] will now be resumed. Mr. Nachiyappa Goundar will move his amendment."

* Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—" Mr. President, Sir, I move—

'*that in line 2 of the resolution after the word " Revenue " the words " and Civil " be inserted.*'

" In moving this amendment, Sir, I should like to draw your attention to the poor lot of the copyists in the civil courts and in the Judicial Department as a whole. They have been agitating for a very long time to get a permanent footing in their posts; but their attempts have not been successful. They were drawing a nominal pay of Rs. 14–8–0 in the year 1922. Owing to their constant agitation and repeated representations, they are supposed to have been given some encouragement in the shape of raising their wages from 10 to 15 pies per every 150 words or fraction thereof. Subsequently, their

[a] Vide Council Proceedings, dated 3rd August 1932.

5th August 1932] [Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder]

nominal pay also was raised from Rs. 14–8–0 to Rs. 20 in the year 1927, the quantity of work to be done by them also being proportionately raised from 28,800 to 38,400 words. In this way, it is found that although there has been a nominal increase in their salary, yet the copyists are getting now practically the same emoluments as they were getting before the change was made. They have not been benefited in any substantial manner. Their lot is in no way better than nor even equal to that of the copyists of the Revenue Department. As an illustration, I may point out that a copyist in the Judicial Department who can copy on an average 64,126 words a month, comprised in 359 pages can earn Rs. 33–7–0 calculated at 15 pies per every 150 words or fraction thereof. A copyist in the Revenue Department, however, for copying the same number of words in the same number of pages gets about Rs. 44–14–0 at the rate of 2 annas per page. Sir, when even the copyists of the Revenue Department are grumbling that they are not getting adequate emoluments for their services, I do not think it is necessary for me to stress the case of the copyists of the Judicial Department, as it is quite evident from the figures I have quoted that their lot is really pitiable. The condition of the copyists of the Revenue Department has been put before the House by my hon. Friend representing Muslims of the City of Madras and I have tried to place before you the case of the copyists of the Judicial Department. I appeal to the hon. the Mover of the resolution, the hon. the Revenue Member, the hon. the Law Member and this Honourable House to accept my amendment. The present condition of the copyists requires favourable consideration at the hands of Government, inasmuch as they are doing a real and important service. In matters of civil suits, for instance, the granting of copies is an important matter, and if the copyists are not able to do the work properly, then a lot of discrepancy and inconvenience is likely to result. We must therefore see that the copyists are contended and are in a position to do their work quickly and satisfactorily in order to be of assistance to the litigant public. It is absolutely necessary in public interests that the lot of these copyists should be improved and their posts should be put on a permanent footing. With these words, Sir, I commend this amendment to the acceptance of the House."

Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI:—" I second it."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" I accept the amendment, Sir."

* Mr. J. A. THORNE:—" Mr. President, Sir, I crave the indulgence of this House, partly because I have not had previous experience as a vocal member of this House and partly because I have been placed somewhat suddenly, in charge of this subject. This amendment, Sir, does not strictly speaking, come within my province as Secretary to the Revenue Department. But, if I may, I shall make some remarks which, though not specifically bearing on this amendment, will have reference to the posts of copyists in both the Revenue and the Judicial departments.

" I am aware, Sir, that this subject first saw the light in this House last January and that this is the third occasion on which it has come

up for debate; and therefore every one no doubt will feel that it is high time that it is disposed of. However, I hope my remarks will not take an unduly long time.

" Firstly, I should like to say that the remarks of the Gentlemen who have spoken in favour of the motion give a somewhat misleading idea of the precariousness of the existence of copyists and examiners. They have no leave facilities, no provident fund, no pension; they live from hand to mouth; one day if they have work they get pay; the next day no work and no pay, and so on. Well, this somewhat exaggerates the pathos of their case. Actually, all examiners in the Presidency—I am speaking now of the Revenue Department—receive a minimum fixed pay of Rs. 18 a month, earning in addition any bonus to which they are entitled for the additional work they do. For most of the copyists, there is similarly a fixed minimum, fixed by the Collector of each district—it may be Rs. 10 or Rs. 15, it is at any rate a nucleus around which they can assemble the bonuses to which they become entitled. One of the hon. Members who supported the motion referred to them as having no provident fund. That is no longer correct. In 1929 the Government passed orders by which, under certain conditions, copyists and examiners may subscribe to the general provident fund. The conditions are, roughly, that their emoluments should be Rs. 20 a month or over and that they should have held their posts for three years or should be likely to hold them for that period. Therefore, that particular grievance in respect of a large number of officers no longer exists.

" As regards the merits of the motion which affects both the departments, the first obvious objection is that this class of officer is not a Government servant in the full sense—in the sense in which members of the clerical services are. The work they do is primarily and mainly not for the benefit of Government but for the benefit of individual members of the public who, for various reasons, have need of copies of Government records and orders. Therefore it would be something of an anomaly to treat them as precisely on the same footing as full-time and permanent clerks in the service of Government.

" Secondly, Sir, they are not constantly employed. Circumstances may happen by which during part of the time they work leisurely and at other times they have to work overtime; but their work is naturally piece-work, and it would be inappropriate if they were allowed to draw full pay day after day when for parts of the day and sometimes all the time on certain days they, unlike their fellow Government servants in the same offices, would be doing nothing at all.

" Then, Sir, I think the motion has been brought forward, at least so far as the Revenue Department is concerned, under a misapprehension. Last year, the Government in reply to a request for information, gave figures of receipts and expenditure for a number of recent years on account of the establishment of copyists and examiners. And it has been urged, on the basis of that statement, that the Government make a handsome profit on this establishment and that the profit should be devoted to improving the terms of their service. Now, that argument

5th August 1932] [Mr. J. A. Thorne]

overlooks a note which has been appended to the statement of expenditure. Note (3) says: 'The "expenditure" includes the pay and bonus allowed under the rules in Board's Standing Order No. 173 to copyists and examiners but excludes the cost of copy stamps to this Government and the allowance for the cost of maintenance and distribution of stocks of such stamps and other overhead charges.' No doubt that statement of receipts and expenditure does show a fairly constant excess of receipts over expenditure, but if the situation were examined on what may be called a commercial 'costing' method, then I think it would be found that the excess was very little, if anything at all. I do not stress the point that Government might fairly be entitled to a profit for maintaining a service which is primarily for the benefit of individual members of the public; but I do say that if this resolution is to be accepted, the immediate consequence must be that the emoluments of copyists and examiners must be reduced. The leave concessions, pensions, etc., would represent a very considerable extra charge—the exact amount of which I cannot now say—but it would certainly mean that unless Government were to spend considerably more on this service, the actual emoluments now drawn by copyists and examiners would be diminished by the amount necessary to provide a leave reserve and to provide pensions for the members of this service. Therefore, it may well be that the copyists and examiners themselves would derive, not any permanent advantage, but a positive disadvantage, at any rate so far as their present emoluments are concerned, from the acceptance of the proposal that they should be made a part of the permanent and pensionable establishment."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I shall now put Mr. Nachiyappa Gounder's amendment to the vote of the House. The question is— 12-45 p.m.

'that in line 2, after the word "Revenue" the words "and Civil" be inserted'."

The amendment was declared lost. Mr. Nachiyappa Gounder demanded a poll and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

1. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
2. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
3. ,, Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
4. Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
5. Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.
6. Khan Bahadur P. Khalifullah Sahib Bahadur.
7. B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur.
8. Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar.
9. Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.
10. Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
11. ,, U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
12. Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi.
13. Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari.
14. ,, V. T. Arasu.
15. ,, G. Sriramulu.
16. S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.

Noes.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur, *Kt.*
2. ,, Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
3. ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
4. ,, Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
5. The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan.
6. ,, Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
7. Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
8. Mr. C. E. Jones.
9. ,, J. A. Thorne.
10. ,, H. M. Hood.

Noes—cont.

11. Mr. R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
12. „ S. H. Slater.
13. „ E. Conran Smith.
14. „ T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
15. Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.
16. Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
17. „ M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.
18. „ M. Devadasan.
19. Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj.
20. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
21. Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
22. Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
23. „ P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
24. „ C. Indriah.
25. „ P. Rayappa Reddi.
26. Rao Bahadur R. K. Venugopal Nayudu.
27. Mr. P. K. Ramachandra Padayachi.
28. Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
29. The Raja of Bobbili.
30. The Raja of Kallikote.
31. The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.
32. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
33. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
34. „ Daniel Thomas.
35. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
36. Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami.
37. „ A. Harischandrudu Nayudu.
38. „ H. M. Jagannatham.
39. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
40. Mr. W. P. A. Soundara Pandian.
41. Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan.
42. Mr. C. Krishnan.

Neutral.

1. Mr. M. S. Sreshta.
2. „ T. Narasa Reddi.
3. „ K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu.
4. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.
5. Dr. P. Subbarayan.
6. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
7. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
8. Mr. K. Koti Reddi.
9. „ A. B. Shetty.
10. „ G. R. Premayya.

Ayes 16. *Noes* 42. *Neutral* 10.

The motion was lost.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I will now put the main resolution to the vote of the House. The question is that—

'*this Council recommends to the Government that the service of copyists and copyist-examiners in the Revenue Courts of this Presidency be made permanent and pensionble*'."

The resolution was declared lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

1. Mr. Daniel Thomas.
2. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
3. Mr. A. Harischandrudu Nayudu.
4. „ K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu.
5. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.
6. Dr. P. Subbarayan.
7. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
8. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
9. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
10. „ K. Koti Reddi.
11. „ Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
12. Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
13. Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.
14. B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur.
15. Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar.
16. „ A. B. Shetty.
17. Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.
18. Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
19. „ K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.
20. Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi.
21. Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari.
22. „ V. T. Arasu
23. „ G. Sriramulu.
24. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
25. Mr. G. R. Premayya
26. S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.

Noes.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur, *Kt.*
2. ,, Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
3. ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
4. ,, Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
5. ,, Mr. P. T. Rajan.
6. ,, Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
7. Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
8. Mr. C. E. Jones.
9. ,, J. A. Thorne.
10. ,, H. M. Hood.
11. ,, R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
12. ,, S. H. Slater.
13. ,, E. Conran Smith.
14. ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
15. ,, K. P. Raman Menon.
16. ,, M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.
17. Mr. M. Devadasan.
18. Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj.
19. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
20. Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
21. Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
22. ,, M. S. Sreshta.
23. ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
24. The Raja of Bobbili.
25. The Raja of Kallikote.
26. The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.
27. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
28. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
29. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
30. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanya Chetti.
31. Mr. J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
32. ,, H. M. Jagannatham.
33. ,, W. P. A. Soundara Pandian.
34. Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan.
35. Mr. C. Krishnan.

Ayes 26. *Noes* 35.

The resolution was lost.

Mr. K. Koti Reddi:—" Mr. President, Sir, under Standing Order 33, I move—

' *that " Resolutions Nos.* 1 *to* 48 *on the agenda do stand adjourned till Resolution No.* 49 *is taken up and disposed of ".*'

" Mr. President, it is an important matter concerning the elections to local boards, the nature of the system that is now in vogue in elections, how it is defective and how it can be reformed. The Council may or may not agree with me, but however, this is the only chance so far as the present elections are concerned. Otherwise, three more years will have to elapse before we get a chance for discussing the question with any usefulness. It is therefore a very important and urgent question concerning the whole of the Presidency in regard to elections which are taking place to the various local boards at present. I do not think it will be necessary to take up much of the time of the House. Now, if this chance is not given, it may not be possible to discuss it for another three years. I know, Sir, many hon. Members are also anxious to get through their work, but as this is a very important matter I am anxious that this should be taken up first. I therefore hope, the Council will allow me an opportunity to move the resolution that stands in my name as No. 49 in the list."

Mr. M. S. Sreshta:—" Mr. President, Sir, I oppose the motion of my hon. Friend. There are also other resolutions which have been pending for a long time. I regret I must object to this motion. I have no objection to my resolution being taken up first and the other resolutions superseded."

The hon. the President:—" I will anyhow put the motion of Mr. Koti Reddi to the vote of the House. The question is—

' *that " all items up to No.* 49 *be postponed until No.* 49 *is disposed of " '.*"

The motion was put and lost.

Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPA Bahadur:—" I move, Sir, that my resolution be taken up first."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I do not see any resolution of the hon. Member in the list of business."

Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPA Bahadur:—" If you just hear me, I am sure you will allow me to move my motion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Order, Order."

CLASSIFICATION OF MADIGAS, CHUCKLIYANS, ETC., AS ARUNDHATHIYAS IN GOVERNMENT RECORDS.

* Mr. H. M. JAGANNATHAM:—" Mr. President, I beg the leave of the House to move the resolution standing in the name of Mr. Ellappa Chettiyar."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to move the resolution."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" No, Sir."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I will put it to the vote of the House. The question is that Mr. Jagannatham be given leave to move Resolution No. 1."

The motion was carried.

* Mr. H. M. JAGANNATHAM:—" Mr. President, Sir, I move that—

' *this Council recommends to the Government that the communities now called Madiga, Chuckliyan, Mathanga, Gosangi, Adi-Jambuva (including Kommu, Chindu, Mastingu) be hereafter entered in Government records as Arundhathiya with the suffix of ' Ayya Garu ' or ' Ayya Avargal '.*

" Sir, I should like to speak a few words in support of this resolution. I shall not engage the House for more than a few minutes. It is a matter of great importance to those who are affected by it, and it is so innocent of any harm to others that not much need be said to commend it to you.

" The members of the Arundhathiya community go by different names in different areas, but they are, not only in all essentials, but in all particulars, one identical community. They speak one language, they worship the same deities, observe the same ceremonials alike in death and marriage, intermarry, and, above all, have been pursuing one and the same industry for thousands upon thousands of years, and there is not one circumstance dividing any one of these sections from any other. What can be there if I may ask, that stands in the way of their being denominated under the real name of their community, the Arundhathiya.

" But it might be asked, ' What good purpose is sought to be served by this resolution? ' In the first place, it would bring to the sections themselves a spirit of unity, a oneness of aims and aspirations and an *esprit de corps* which is one of the greatest essentials of a community's progress. Knowledge is not realization, indeed every one of every

5th August 1932] [Mr. H. M. Jagannatham]

section of the community knows, and would answer when asked, that he is an Arundhathiya, but how few of them realize its significance, I need not say.

" Secondly, a recognition by the Government of the oneness of all the sections of our community would greatly facilitate their endeavours to obtain from it an adequate consideration of their joint grievances. Should this resolution commend itself to the House, I request that necessary instructions may be issued to the concerned quarters and to the Census Officer to classify them under the name of ' Arundathiyas '."

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI :—" Sir, I have very great pleasure in seconding this resolution which has just been moved by my hon. Friend Mr. Jagannatham. All the communities mentioned by Mr. Jagannatham have unanimously resolved that they should be called ' Arundhathiyas ' and no words of mine are therefore necessary to commend the resolution for the acceptance of the House."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The resolution is now for the discussion of the House."

The House will now adjourn and meet again at 3 p.m.

After Lunch (3 p.m.)

VIII.—ELECTION OF A MEMBER TO THE SENATE OF THE MADRAS UNIVERSITY.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The following two members were nominated for the election of a Member to the Senate of the Madras University :—

1. S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.
2. Mr. P. C. Moses.

" S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur has since withdrawn his candidature. As there is only one candidate left, viz., Mr. P. C. Moses, I declare him duly elected."

IX.—APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMEN OF SELECT COMMITTEES ON CERTAIN BILLS.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I appoint Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam as the Chairman of the Select Committee on the Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920 (Bills Nos. 9 and 10 of 1932).

" I appoint Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan as the Chairman of the Select Committee on the Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920 (Bill No. 25 of 1931)."

VII.—RESOLUTIONS ON MATTERS OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST—*cont.*

CLASSIFICATION OF MADIGAS, CHUCKLIYANS, ETC., AS ARUNDHATHIYAS IN GOVERNMENT RECORDS—*cont.*

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Discussion on Mr. Jagannatham's resolution will now be continued."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I was searching in the Census Report for all these names given in the resolution, and I don't find all of them in that report. I find only two names in it, namely, Madigas and Chuckliyans. But on a reference to Mr. Thurston's book called 'Castes and Tribes of Southern India,' I find most of these names in it with different spellings. Apparently they are all synonyms of Madigas and Chuckliyans. All that I can say with reference to this resolution is that if any member of any of these communities wants to call himself by any appellation or special name, Government have no objection to recognize that appellation or name. For instance, if he wants to write a letter to Government, he may adopt any appellation, any suffix or any prefix to his name, and if his letter requires a reply Government will address him in the way in which he styles himself. Beyond that, I can't give any undertaking on behalf of the Government. My Friend will concede the fact that it is obviously impossible to edit all the old Government records and change the names appearing there."

Mr. H. M. JAGANNATHAM :—" I only want that this should be taken notice of by Government for their future guidance."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" With reference to that, Government will not object to any member of any community styling himself in any way he likes."

Mr. H. M. JAGANNATHAM :—" According to the hon. Law Member Government records contain not only 'Madigas' and 'Chuckliyans' but also Arundhathiyas, etc."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" As I said, all these names are in one form or another synonyms of the names Madigas and Chuckliyans. Probably in different localities different names are used. I hope that with this assurance the hon. Member will be satisfied."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU :—" Sir, if I understand my friend aright, he wants to know if Government will call hereafter these communities by the name of Arundhathiyas, just as they are calling Pariahs by the appellation of Adi-Dravidas. If that assurance is given, he may not press his motion."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" If they call themselves Arundhathiyas, Government also will call them Arundhathiyas. It is only that assurance that Government can give."

The resolution was put and carried.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CENTRAL CO-OPERATIVE ARTISAN BANK.

Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI :—" Mr. President, Sir, under Standing Order No. 55 (3) I beg leave of the House to move resolution No. 2 regarding the establishment of a Central Co-operative Artisan Bank which stands in the name of my esteemed Friend, Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu."

The House signified its consent.

5th August 1932]

* Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI:—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

'This Council recommends to the Government to introduce a Bill in the Local Legislature for opening a Central Co-operative Artisan Bank in the City of Madras and for organizing branches at various localities in the mufassal for the exclusive use of the artisan classes of this Presidency on the lines of the Central Land Mortgage Bank.'

" Sir, I need not say much in support of the resolution. Neither the Government nor the popular leaders have taken effective measures to materially help the poor cottage industrial workmen. Unless home industries are encouraged and improved side by side with agriculture, all-round national advance cannot be secured. I understand that there are several agencies of Government to help the industrial workmen in the United Kingdom, America, Germany and Japan, but it is regrettable that the Government here have not yet come forward with any proposal in that direction.

" The establishment of the Bank with its branches suggested in the resolution for the exclusive use of the occupational classes will go a long way in reviving the indigenous industries in the Presidency. When I moved a cut motion in the last Budget discussions urging the hon. the Minister for Public Works to be pleased to introduce a Bill for the establishment of the Artisans' Bank in this Presidency at his earliest convenience on the lines of the Land Mortgage Bank Bill, he was pleased to reply that the suggestion would receive his careful consideration. I am indeed grateful for his sympathetic and courteous reply, but I only request him to take up the matter in the near future.

" I know that we are at present taken off our feet by the wave of the serious world-wide economic depression. But if the Government signify their consent to carry out this suggestion by way of introducing a Bill they may start such banks at their earliest convenience when their financial position materially improves. As cottage industries are dying for want of funds I appeal to the hon. Members of the House to vote for this motion and thus help the poor industrial workman and win his everlasting gratitude. This sort of public service is new to this country, and I once more appeal to the hon. the Second Minister to undertake the same. This would add a feather to his cap and his name and fame would be perpetuated thereby.

" With these words I commend the resolution to the acceptance of the House."

Mr. H. B. ARI GOWDER:—" I second the motion."

* The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" Mr. President, Sir, the hon. Member has said that the Government are not supporting any artisan societies. It is true that the Government are not directly supporting any. But the co-operative society is assisting the artisan societies whenever these societies are formed. At present there are 157 societies of

[Mr. P. T. Rajan] [5th August, 1932

this nature. The majority of them belong to the weavers' community. As a matter of fact Government are offering facilities by way of lending officers and by way of loans of money to these societies. One of such is in Salem. The idea of starting a central bank with branches all over the Presidency so that money could be given them by way of loans could very well be taken up by the existing central banks. If only such societies apply to the Registrar, certainly they could be registered. It is not so much the necessary funds as more facilities for selling these articles that are required. I am afraid in these days it is not possible to give them what they want. I may tell them that the Central Land Mortgage Bank was introduced with a view to help the various land mortgages in the mufassal. In spite of the Government help to the Central Land Mortgage Bank, it has not been in a position, owing to the economic condition, to function properly. When things are like that, I don't think a Bill like the one proposed would succeed. And even assuming that the necessity for a Central Bank of the character proposed is found, I may tell the House that there is no necessity for any legislation whatsoever. That bank can be ushered into existence by the Registrar, if those who are interested in the societies and in the formation of the bank would go to him and represent that they are prepared to take the necessary shares and so on. I think if the House is very keen and the members of the artisan class are really interested in bringing about the formation of a central institution like the one proposed, it is open to them to go to the Registrar and say so. And Government will instruct the Registrar to render all help possible."

The resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

ORGANIZATION OF A STATE LOTTERY ON THE LINES OF THE IRISH FREE STATE LOTTERY.

* Mr. M. S. SRESHTA :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg leave of the House to move the resolution standing in the name of Mr. M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar."

The House signified its assent.

* Mr. M. S. SRESHTA :—" Sir, the resolution which I am moving runs as follows :—

> '*This Council recommends to the Government that a State lottery on the lines of the Irish Free State Lottery be organized by Government to carry on or finance public utility undertakings, such as trunk roads, bridges, water-supply, rural medical aid and elementary education, which now suffer owing to the need for retrenchment.*'

" This resolution requires a little explanation. It may seem that the method of collecting revenue by means of lottery is a novel one. As a matter of fact, however, this lottery idea is by no means novel. In almost every European State a State lottery is organized not as an abnormal or as a temporary expedient for raising revenue but as a

5th August 1932] [Mr. M. S. Sreshta]

normal means of raising revenue. In Tasmania one-third of the revenue is collected annually by means of lotteries. And as you know there are sweepstakes and lotteries all over Europe.

"The question is why a system of raising revenue which is not considered wrong in many of the advanced countries should not be adopted in India as at least an exceptional measure. The only civilized country perhaps which has been not consistently in favour of lotteries is England. Even there there have been lotteries at different times. The famous institution of the British Museum owes its existence to a State lottery. The Sloane collection was, I believe, purchased with the proceeds of a lottery. Even so recently as the Great War the Victory Bonds Lottery was organized with the help of the State. Therefore to say that this idea offends the ethical sense, that it is wrong in principle and that it should not be adopted seems to be a very extraordinary reasoning. My proposal now is not to organize a State lottery as a permanent source of revenue but only during the present exceptional times when Government finds it difficult to carry out its commitments. When people are turned out of employment for want of funds, when all humane considerations are cast aside and people are thrown away to the mercies of private charity I think we have got a right to consider alternative sources of revenue. It may be said that the Bombay Legislative Council has passed a resolution in favour of a State lottery. When the resolution was being proposed in the Council the Member of Government in charge of the portfolio said that the Bombay Government had already recommended to the Central Government the establishment of a State lottery. The Member said that if the Legislative Council passed the resolution to the effect that a State lottery should be organized the Government would forward the resolution to the Central Government and he hoped that the resolution would be successful. The question is why what is considered right by responsible Members of Government in Bombay should be opposed in Madras. The only reason for opposing this resolution appears to be that we are not a bankrupt Government whereas the Bombay Government has not been able to balance its budget. But how are we balancing our budget? We are throwing out our men from employment. We, Members of Council, are in close touch with the people and we know what amount of suffering is caused by people being turned ont of employment. When we want something to be done which is beneficial to the country, what is the reply that we get? 'No funds are available.' Why should not agricultural experts be appointed? The answer given the other day by the Minister in charge was: 'No funds are available.' Whenever some public utility schemes are pressed on the attention of the Ministers they say, 'We are very willing, we are very anxious to help the country but no funds are available.' In this state of affairs can you say that the Madras Government is solvent? If it is, it is so by casting aside all humane considerations and at the expense of industries which are stifled. I think that this sort of solvency is hardly an excuse for not adding to the revenue. Involuntary taxation is not possible for us. No Government will propose fresh taxation and, if it does, there is no

3-15 p.m.

[Mr. M. S. Sreshta] [5th August 1932

chance of its continuing in power. With regard to the proposed lottery it is a method of raising revenue by voluntary means. The question will be asked whether there is sufficient money in the country? The answer to that question is that a large amount of money is being drained away from India now, to Ireland and the Portuguese territory in Goa. So large an amount as Rs. 2,000 per month is being sent every week from South Kanara. I believe a large amount is being sent from Madras and Bombay also. When we analyse the feeling against lotteries in England I think it will be found that it is due to the success which has attended the Irish State Lottery. It has been draining away 14 million pounds during the last 12 months from England after deducting the commission and prizes paid in England. If it is considered ethically wrong to have any sweepstakes let the Government take a strong attitude and let all sweepstakes be abolished. So long as you tolerate the totalisator in the Madras Race Course and so long as you tolerate similar things, it is absurd to become at once a highly moral individual and say, ' We cannot have a State lottery." The Home Office Legal Expert says that at present the law has been found to be absolutely helpless against lotteries. The law reflects the attitude of Government. Government are not able to say, ' Sweepstakes ought to be prevented. We will stop all these vicious ideas.' They only say, ' We cannot have a legalized lottery which will be under the control of the State.' I think, Mr. President, that this is a very weak attitude. If a lottery is improper, stop all forms of it; otherwise it is perfectly right to have a legalized lottery to divert the flow in the proper channel and enrich the coffers of the State. I will go further and say that so long as we have not our own lotteries it is not possible to stop the drain of money that goes out of the country for buying lottery tickets. When once we have our own lotteries we will be able to stop the drain. It is said that the Calcutta Sweepstake earnings have very much diminished owing to the Irish lottery. Similarly if we have a sweepstake of our own, it will be possible to stop most of the money which goes out of India. By having a sweepstake of our own we shall not be taxing people in a novel manner. We shall only divert the flow of money in one direction and bring it into our own country. I would also point out that there are reasons behind the British feeling against lottery. You will remember that a Bill was moved some months ago in Parliament for the introduction of lotteries. It failed because the conditions in England are different from the conditions in India. Money was wanted for financing hospitals. There are about a thousand voluntary hospitals in Great Britain and they secure by voluntary contribntions something like 30 million pounds per annum. Where the contributions come in so freely there is no need for a lottery. But is it possible to have voluntary contributions to the same extent in India? It is not possible. We are doing private charity rather than organized public charity. As a matter of fact most of the hospitals are in charge of the State. Therefore we cannot entirely draw a parallel from England. Again it has been said that no Government in the world is more socialistic in its activities than the Government of India. The Government of India

5th August 1932] [Mr. M. S. Sreshta]

deliberately takes part in socialistic activities. That is not the case in England. There the *laissez faire* system prevails and Government does not interfere with private enterprise. Everything is done by private charity as much as possible and the State interferes as little as possible. This is not possible in India. To say that we must follow the same principles that are being followed in England is to ignore entirely the psychology of the East. So long as Government does take part in commercial enterprises it is necessary that the sources of revenue must be more elastic than in England. Then at the present time all our industries are struggling. I do not know how long this period of retrenchment will last. Are we to stop all industrial enterprise? There is a very good source of revenue in the Bellary and the Ceded districts ceramic industry. But it cannot be exploited because no funds are available. I say that it is not desirable that we should follow the precedent set up in England but we should go on the facts before us and Members of Government should as practical statesmen not think of ethical standards which are peculiar or which are not agreed to by the bulk of the people of the world. There is nothing inherently vicious in the lottery principle. As a matter of fact I would have had no chance of proposing this resolution but for the success in balloting. There is practically no species of business or human activity in which there is no element of chance.

" To say that the element of chance should not come in as regards raising revenue is establishing a proposition which cannot be sustained. 3-30 p.m. The precedent which we might follow is the one set by the Bombay Legislative Council. The conditions in Bombay are the same as the conditions here. They may perhaps be a little more in want of money than ourselves. But it is a question of degree. It was found to be necessary to add to the sources of revenue there somehow or other. The proposer of the lottery there happened to be a gentleman who was always against gambling and against the Betting Act. But he explained that the conditions were such in Bombay that it was necessary to go in for some kind of State lottery. So far as I could see, his resolution met with no opposition from the Members of the Legislative Council or the Members of the Government. I hope that this House will take the same attitude that the Bombay Council took and that we shall act as reasonable and practical men, as men of the world and not adopt standards of ethics which are not followed practically by any religion. As I have said, not only Christian churches but also Hindu temples are being built with the aid of lotteries. There is no big charity which does not depend to some extent on lottery.

" As regards the economic aspect, it may be argued that people depending on making fortunes by means of lotteries will become lazy and give up doing work and that all scientific and industrial development will come to an end. Such an argument shows a lack of sense of proportion. There is no fear at all for such dislocation of industry or business. This State lottery will only displace the lotteries to which we are already subscribing, and it need not be feared

that the people will be contracting any new vice thereby. There is much more to be said on the subject, but I shall not take up any more time of the House and tax your patience. I only hope that what I have said will make the House understand that the position is a very serious one and that at this moment we must treat the question seriously. If there is really any harm in the proposal which has been made, either that it will fail or otherwise, I shall not myself ask this House to vote for this proposition. As regards details, they can be considered later on when the principle has been accepted. It may be that instead of a simple lottery, lottery loans or the issue of premium bonds may be established. To prevent prizes in cash leaving the country, prize-winners may be paid in Government securities. These are all details which may be worked out later on. But at the present moment, I only request this House to think over this resolution carefully and pass it. Leave it to Government to work out the details and to formulate some scheme of lottery which is not in any way outrageous to one's sense of ethics."

* Mr. A. B. Shetty:—" Mr. President, I second the resolution. Sir, my hon. Friend, Mr. Sreshta, seems to have bestowed a good deal of thought and attention on this matter. I know he has been interesting himself in this question for a fairly long time now, and I venture to think that he has made a fairly good case for the resolution. Sir, State lotteries have been conducted in several countries in the West. I find that in 1894, Prussia got as much as £487,675 by means of lottery, Austria got £748,672, Spain got £960,000 and Italy raised a million pounds by means of a State lottery. In England, the first State lottery was conducted in 1567. Between the years 1709 and 1825, they were raising large sums of money in England by State lotteries every year. It is true they abolished this system of State lottery about a century ago. But there is a considerable body of opinion in favour of instituting such lotteries in England even to-day. My hon. Friend referred to the motion brought last year in the Parliament asking for leave to bring in a Bill to authorize the raising of money by means of lotteries for the support of hospitals. It is true this motion was defeated by 181 persons voting against 58 who voted in support of it. But, Sir, it is worth noting that out of 239 people, nearly 25 per cent voted in favour of the motion. The Special Committee of Appeal in connexion with St. Bartholomew's hospital sent out a questionnaire to thousands of representative people in connexion with their appeal for funds for that hospital, and the result up to the time this motion was brought in the Parliament was that 3,125 people were stated to be in favour of starting a lottery in aid of the hospital, and only 61 people were against it. So that, we see that even in England where there is such a strong feeling against State lottery there is even to-day a considerable body of opinion in favour of instituting a system of State lottery. In the neighbouring country of Ireland it is well known how they are having their sweepstakes. It is said that two years ago they got £600,000 by means of the sweepstake and in the next year they were

5th August 1932] [Mr. A. B. Shetty]

expecting to get £500,000. My hon. Friend has already spoken of the move of the Bombay Government in the matter of instituting a State lottery. The Bombay Government had to curtail their medical facilities on account of financial stringency. In June 1931, they made a request to the Government of India to allow them to institute a State lottery for the purpose of raising money in aid of their hospitals. The Government of India turned down this proposal. They repeated the request in October last year, and again the Government of India refused to do anything in the matter. On the 15th of March this year, a resolution was brought forward in the Bombay Council by a non-official Member recommending to the Government that they should institute a State lottery for the purpose of supporting their hospitals. This resolution, as my hon. Friend pointed out, received support from all sides of the House, and the Government also welcomed it. They said that they would forward it to the Government of India and try to see whether they could make the Government of India revise their decision and get if necessary, the sanction of the Secretary of State. The Government of India, it would appear, were unwilling to forward to the Secretary of State the request previously made by the Bombay Government because, in view of the declaration made by the Members of His Majesty's Government in connexion with the Irish Sweepstakes, they did not expect the matter would be viewed with favour by the Home Government. As Mr. Sreshta has pointed out, Sir, outsiders are carrying away a good deal of money from this country by means of lotteries. The Goa Government is carrying on a lottery from month to month and a good many of their tickets are being sold in our province. Even the tickets for the Irish Sweepstakes are being sold here. One of the Members of the Bombay Council said at the time the resolution on the starting of a Government lottery was under discussion that as much as 25 to 30 lakhs of rupees is being taken away from the Bombay Presidency alone by the sale of the Irish Sweepstake tickets. The passion for gambling seems to be an infirmity common to most people. Some of the best of our men gamble every day at the club. The rich as well as the poor are allowed to gamble at the race course. The Government does not object to the totalizator. It allows private lotteries. There are any number of private lotteries being held now. (The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar: No.) Does not the Law Member know that the Government have allowed a lottery organized by the Flying Club at Trichinopoly and its tickets are being sold to-day in Madras."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" I may just interrupt my hon. Friend. The Government have never sanctioned any private lottery."

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" If the Government regulates and controls the lottery, there will be no chance of fraud. I cannot see any serious objection to the legalization of lottery held under proper public control and for approved public purposes. All that my hon. Friend wants is that Government should institute a lottery to tide over this present

difficult time and get the funds necessary for the nation-building departments. I am sure our genial friend, the Development Minister, would very much welcome this proposal for providing money for the starving departments under him. I request the House to consider and give their support to the proposal which is contained in my hon. Friend's resolution."

Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar:—"Mr. President, Sir, I am sorry to see that this resolution has been introduced in this House at this stage. I thought the Members of this House would have been feeling happy that so far as this province is concerned she has in a way rounded the corner and that after the retrenchment proposals which were given effect to it has been possible for the Madras Government to balance the budget, and we could expect the Madras Government to carry on without much difficulty. It was also expressed at the last meeting of the Legislative Council and also admitted by Government that it may be possible in the coming year for even the cut in salaries to be restored. Under these circumstances, Sir, I fail to see the abnormal condition which makes hon. Members of this House think of a proposal like this. The hon. Mover of this resolution said that it is the practice in many European countries to start such lotteries. But I am afraid, Sir, he made his case very weak when he referred to England. He said that for some years the English Government has stood out against lotteries, and the hon. Member who seconded the resolution also said that for a century or so the practice that obtained in England of supporting lotteries had been abandoned. If England in spite of the many troubles she had was able to get through her difficulties fairly and squarely without resorting to methods considered not quite straight. I do not see any reason why India and this Presidency in particular should think of starting a lottery. I am afraid, Sir, certain reasons put forward by hon. Members of this House do not carry conviction. My hon. Friend, the Mover, said that certain ethical standards need not be adopted. I was sorry to hear that statement made on the floor of this House.

3-45 p.m. "It may be that in some places ethical standards are not observed strictly. Even if there was a dire necessity, I would not vote for a proposition of this kind, seeing that it is the State that has to set the ethical standards. Taking the example of England, to which the hon. Mover referred, I can say that when faced with great difficulties the English statesmen were able to face the situation squarely by meeting the demands made on the State. If it was a question of reparations there was an adjustment by party meetings; if it was a question of a National Government being formed to stop certain unnecessary expenditure that had been incurred by the Labour Government, immediately a National Government was formed, and all items of expenditure that were considered unnecessary were immediately put down. The Labour Government, much less the other parties, did not agree to a State lottery to pay unemployment doles. If they thought that unemployment doles could not be given by the State, they decided

5th August 1932] [Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar]

to stop them. It was not thought that a lottery system could be adopted to meet the unemployment doles. If it was a question of the National debt or the interest on the National debt being very high, then the method was adopted of asking the creditors themselves whether they would go in for the conversion loan, and we see the happy response to that appeal made by the Premier. Why should we not follow such methods? We are glad to note that England has been able to set a high standard to the world and India may follow their example and need not resort to lottery.

"My Friend, the Mover, referred to the sufferings of those who are unemployed. May I say, Sir, if only a lottery is started, instead of decreasing their sufferings, it will only increase them! For the unemployed themselves will throw away the little money in the lottery and suffer all the more.

"Reference was made to the fact that there are certain private lotteries. If Government really enforce the gambling laws, these private lotteries would be stopped. Two wrongs cannot make one right. Instead of taking up one, Government should stop all private lotteries that have been going on stealthily. It may be said that laudable objects may be secured by means like this, in other words, that the end justifies the means. I am afraid it is an ethical standard to which I personally I cannot subscribe, and I do not think many Members in this House will subscribe to it. In any case it should not be set up as a precept to be followed by any Government, much less the Madras Government."

Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"Mr. President, even the hon. Mover himself admits that it is immoral to have recourse to lottery. (Cries of No, No.) Otherwise no licence would be required for this. This special legislation is now sought to be justified on grounds of financial stringency. That is, it means a special pleading, and the special pleading means that there is something wrong at the bottom. Lottery is prohibited by law, and even according to the Hindu Sastras it is against *dharma* and the king must take measures to put it down. It affords opportunity to improvident people to throw away what they have with a view to getting more. That is gambling really. In the present case, it will be a more civilized and more amplified form of gambling. Gambling is really the exploitation of the imprudent. On the floor of this House, Member after Member has condemned drinking. Why? Some improvident people go to the liquor house and throw away their money and thereby increase the revenue of the Government. But we do not like that Government revenue should increase by the suffering of imprudent people. That is the reason why we say there must be prohibition. If that is so, how is lottery different from raising money from excise? One man of course may be benefited by lottery, but that ill-gotten wealth will be spent very soon; but so many other people will lose their money. Therefore it is immoral on that ground, and this Council should have nothing to do with such things, and the State should not patronize lotteries.

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo] [5th August 1932

" Another thing also may be considered. So many people say that Government was clever enough to link excise revenue with the expansion of elementary education. They do not like such an idea, because no ill-gotten wealth should be used for the expansion of elementary education. That is the *dharma* of the king. If in other countries they do such things, it is not necessary that we should follow them. On the contrary we can show to them that we are not so immoral as they are."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—" I am sorry I have to oppose the motion of my Friend, Mr. Sreshta. Mr. Sreshta has no doubt made out a very good case for his proposal, but I am sorry he has not convinced some of us with regard to the ethical nature of his proposal. He has tried to persuade some of us into the belief that whatever may be the ethical character of the object of this motion, the end justifies the means. I do not think the State can adopt such a line of argument. It is wrong and immoral to organize lotteries. As my Friend, Mr. Patnaik, said it is the duty of the State to set up a very high standard for people to follow. As it is, lotteries are prohibited, and it is a grave crime to run lotteries. I do not know how the Government which regards lottery as a crime can itself conduct a lottery. It will have to alter its laws before it runs a sweepstake. No doubt, we have to find money for very good objects that we wish to advance. I do not think that my Friend, Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar, was right in saying that the Government in England was adopting very high moral standards for tiding over the financial difficulties with which it was faced. The financial difficulties in England are of quite a different nature from those prevailing here. It is a different kind of gamble in England and we need not copy it. We have certain standards and we must follow them. In our country we must follow the high oriental morals, and we should not follow the methods of either Ireland or Switzerland or any other country in the West or in the far East, in order to raise money even for advancing good objects. No doubt, Mr. Sreshta's argument might seem convincing when he said that when the Government was exploiting the weakness of our countrymen in their excise policy and making money by selling drink, why should they not raise money by running a lottery for advancing certain laudable objects. But, as Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar said, two wrongs cannot make a right. No doubt, the Government is following a wrong policy in exploiting the weakness of our people to find money for purposes of education or any other good purpose. But the time has come to correct the mistake. Our task in the future will be very great if we go on heaping one wrong upon another. The Government in order to free itself of this charge will have to stop all kinds of gamble, which is somehow or other allowed, for example the race-course at Guindy and other places. If the Government stops the gambling in the races and also does not exploit the weakness of the people by their excise policy, I am sure Mr. Sreshta would not have come forward with a resolution of this character. All gambling is wrong, and the House knows that

5th August 1932] [Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan]

the Mussalmans have great objection to gambling, and I am sure in the religion of no community is gambling sanctioned. So, I hope all Members of the House will unite in not allowing the motion of Mr. Sresta to be carried through."

* The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes:—" Mr. President, very interesting speeches have been made this afternoon on both sides of the House, both by the Mover of the resolution and by those who opposed it, and I do not think I can add very much to the debate. The resolution proposes that a state lottery on the lines of the Irish Free State lottery be organized by Government for various public purposes.

" So far as has been ascertained, Irish Sweep Stakes cannot be stated to be a State lottery in the sense in which it is recommended here to be adopted. Apparently is is held for a limited purpose, viz., to open a hospital. It is held under the provisions of a particular Act, viz., The Public Charitable Hospitals Act of 1930, passed by the Irish Legislature, and conducted, not by the Government, but by the Hospitals Committee. Drawing takes place under the superintendence of the Chief Commissioner of Police in Dublin and 25 per cent of the net proceeds after collection is paid to the hospital and the remaining 75 per cent is divided into prizes. There have been five of these sweep stakes between December 1930 and March 1932 and the public in the United Kingdom and throughout the world have subscribed to it not less than £13,800,000. Of that sum, they have received £7,700,000 in prizes. Expenses and commissions of the Sweep Stakes have involved an expenditure of £300,000 and of the total sum of £13,800,000 subscribed by the public only £2,800,000 has been given to the hospital. It has been calculated roughly that people from Great Britain have subscribed altogether £9,500,000 and received by way of prizes £5,000,000. The commission on sale of tickets has amounted to £600,000. 4 p.m.

" Various arguments were advanced in the course of the speeches that have been made, and the fact was in particular emphasized that in many of the countries in Europe lotteries have been and are being recognized as a legitimate source of raising revenue. What has not been emphasized by the speakers in favour of this motion has been the point that in many of the most advanced countries in Europe—England is one of them—the system of State lotteries was definitely abandoned as having been harmful to the morale of the population. So long ago as 1808 there was a Select Committee of Parliament to enquire into the whole question. Up to that time, as has been pointed out, the system of lotteries had for a long time been recognized in England itself and this is what the Committee reported at that time:—

'In the meantime your committee find that by the effects of the lottery even under the present restrictions, idleness, dissipation and poverty are increased. The most sacred and confidential trusts are betrayed, domestic comfort is destroyed, madness often created, crimes subjecting the perpetrators of them to the punishment of death are committed an even suicide itself is produced as willfully appear by the evidence submitted to the House.'

"In 1918, when the matter came up before the House of Commons, at any rate it is reported so, the Chief Constable of Manchester, who gave evidence before the Select Committee, stated as follows:—

'Gambling in any form is one of the most important and one of the most perplexing problems of the day. If it is carried to excess, it is a most serious vice which enslaves its victims so as to make it morally impossible for them to throw off its influence. Once indulged in and given way to, it appears to monopolise a man's thoughts to the exclusion of all others, either of business, home or rational pleasure and very often it leads to direct ruin.'

"The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the course of a debate in Parliament, drew attention to the evils of the system and said as follows:—

'I do not believe that anybody will really be made into a thrifty man by the sudden winning of a prize which is beyond the dreams of any one. I think it is contrary to all experience and in my opinion the result of your issuing of premium bonds will not be that you will make a man to save who has not saved before but that it will induce a man to gamble who has hitherto saved.

'There is a great deal too much of the spirit of gambling in the country to-day, too much of the disposition to get rich quickly. It is not that spirit that will help us in our difficulties or carry us to safety. What we require is sober, steady, honest work and the more you turn the people's attention to chance, the more you take them away from strenuous effort and continuous hard work.'

"I think that sums up adequately the general case against State lotteries based on the experience gained in Western countries. In this country, whatever may be the income that will be derived from starting these lotteries and whatever may be the defects in the application of law at the present time, those objections apply. At present such lotteries are illegal. I quite admit that in certain respects the law at the present time may not be enforced as strictly as it might be. But, it is one thing to say that the law at present is not strictly applied, that there are now many private lotteries going on plundering the peoples' money and that Government are allowing these lotteries to go on, and it is quite another thing to say that the State should come forward itself and induce the people to go in for gambling. That is what the establishment of a State lottery would mean. It may be that lotteries ought to be stopped. That is no argument for the proposition which we are now considering. I think it was Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar who said that two wrongs cannot make a right. Not only in England was the system of State lotteries abolished so long ago as 1826 or so but in other countries also. This is what I find in the report:—

'The pernicious effects of the State sanction of the vice of gambling have led to the abandonment of the lottery system in England and in 1826, Hesse 1832, France 1830, Sweden 1840, Bavaria 1861, Switzerland 1865 and various other countries.'

"Sir, I do not know whether it has anything to do with the post-war psychology that we get now an agitation for the establishment of State lotteries. It may perhaps be conjectured that that has something to do with the movement which has manifested itself in England and more especially in Ireland, and again in this country in recent years. It may perhaps be asked whether in Ireland there has been any evidence of the harmful effects of these lotteries which have been established

5th August 1932] [Mr. H. G. Stokes]

since 1930. There is such evidence. I find that in April 1931 when the system had been going on for about a year or so, the Dublin Merchants' Association made a protest to the Irish Free State Government on the subject. They reported thus:—

'We have also seen during the past year a very disquieting increase in the desire of many to get something for nothing.

(I think we all suffer from that weakness.)

'We have asked the attention of the business section of the population to the great danger to its interests by the tremendous increase in gambling in the Irish Free State. Consequently we have ventured to put our views before the Ministers of the Government as follows:—'That we view with concern the amount of gambling in the Free State which diverts both energy and money from industry and commerce and causes grave disturbance to the public mind.'

"So that you will see what the opinion of a responsible body of merchants in Dublin has been in regard to this State lottery. I suppose a year or two of their experience of the pernicious effects of the system of State lottery has converted them to this opinion. My Friend, Mr. Sreshta, rather contemptuously brushed aside the ethical arguments that may be advanced against these lotteries. To my mind they are the most important of all. I feel sure the House will better realize its responsibility before voting on this motion one way or the other, than he seems to have done. I regard it as a most serious thing that Government should come forward and start a gambling of this kind which will be a cause of ruin to the many millions not only of really poor people but of many others who draw very small incomes. It is all very well to say, as Mr. Sreshta put it, that we have become bankrupt and that something ought to be done for establishing the financial equilibrium of this Province. I venture to suggest that his statement of our financial position is a gross exaggeration. It is quite true that we are passing through very difficult times and that our financial position is causing anxiety. We have been obliged to cut down our expenditure on various items and I stated in reply to a question that was put to me what has been accomplished in connexion with retrenchment in this Province. It is quite true that we are passing through difficult times and that we should find some means of making up our deficit. But on that account are we to adopt a system by which we will take away the money from the people's pocket and at the same time induce them to go into a state of habitual extravagance and recklessness? It seems to me that the House should bear in mind the possible effects of the extension of that spirit of gambling in people's minds, the growth of a desire to get rich quickly, and to get something for nothing. The House should also bear in mind the possible effects of that spirit on such movements as the co-operative movement which depends for its vitality on the encouragement of the habit of saving and thrift. Of course, the idea of these State lotteries presents us with a very delightful picture of the establishment of schools, opening of hospitals and laying out of new roads and so forth and that the expenditure on the development of these things can be met from the proceeds of such lotteries. Otherwise for finding money for the development of these items we

will have to resort to additional taxation. While I am bound to say that additional taxation is not desirable, I would rather have it than getting money by starting lotteries the effects of which, on the economic morale of the population, cannot be calculated, and are for that reason easily lost sight of. It is all very well to advocate these lotteries in high terms remembering only the fact that a sweeper here or a cooly there gets Rs. 10,000 or Rs. 50,000, but we forget the fact that, if one or two people get thousands, millions of people are made bankrupt. Those are very serious effects which the House should bear in mind.

" I do not know if I should detain the House much longer in explaining the reasons why we are unable to accept this proposal. It is entirely incorrect to suggest that we are in so serious a financial predicament that we must accept this expedient. Nothing of the kind. We hope to have a balanced budget in the coming year and possibly something better. And we hope that with great self-restraint in financial matters and in the matter of our expenditure, we shall be able to tide over the present time of stress. I hope therefore the House will reflect carefully before it adopts this resolution which I regard as pernicious in the extreme."

4-15 p.m. Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—" Mr. President, I have nothing to add to what I have said in the beginning in moving my resolution. But I should like to contradict one statement made by the hon. the Finance Member, namely, that the situation in this Presidency is not so bad as I sought to make out and the statement made by me was a bit exaggerated. I shall appeal to hon. Members of the House who are more in touch with the people and with the unemployed especially, to say whether the statement I made with regard to the sufferings of the people is true or not. It may be that some of my inferences are wrong, but I am sure none of my statements are exaggerated. It is unfortunate that the British precedent is against us in this matter, but I have taken pains to show clearly how the conditions in England are different from the conditions in Madras. Even there, of late there has been a change of view. It is not statesmanlike to cling for all time to ideals and standards which are absolutely impracticable. I am as absolutely sure of my statement as the hon. the Finance Member was of his, that if this resolution was passed there would be no increase whatever of the gambling tendency, but it would only divert the flow of money, now going outside, to our own pockets. We agitate against huge sums of money going out of our country in the shape of salaries and pensions, but see how much goes out of the country for the purchase of lottery tickets. Is not that to be stopped? If this resolution is not passed, the Government must put a stop to all sweepstakes and lotteries in the country. If they are not able to do that, I do not see why they should not agree to this resolution."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Mr. President, Sir, but for the concluding remarks of the hon. Member who has just sat down, I would not have intervened in this debate at all. I am not a puritan

in my outlook and I do not look upon lotteries from the point of view of a puritan. There is no doubt an element of gambling instinct in every man, but that does not mean that we should encourage that instinct, or that it would be proper for the Government of a country to encourage it. I am glad the hon. the Finance Member has opposed this resolution in very strong terms. But I am not against lotteries being conducted by respectable private persons in order to finance highly laudable objects of public utility. My objection to the State running a lottery is not on the ground that it will tend to lower our ethical ideals and spoil the *morale* of the people. I do not oppose it on the ground that a State lottery will encourage habits of thriftlessness in the people. But the contingency that by means of a State lottery the Government can collect a lot of money will induce any Finance Member to budget for a greater expenditure than the ordinary income warrants. There is another objection also to the State running a lottery. A State lottery is another means of taxation of the people—an indirect taxation of the people. All indirect taxes are bad in principle, but we have to levy them as a matter of extreme necessity and not as an ordinary means of getting the State's revenues. But once the State begins to run a lottery, many people will not have the freedom to buy or not buy a ticket as in the case of private sweepstakes; persuasion, pressure and coercion will be brought to bear upon them in one shape or another, so much so, there will be hardly any distinction between the purchase of a ticket and the payment of a tax. It is for these reasons that I oppose the proposal to ask the Government to run a lottery.

" But the Government need not stand in the way of respectable persons organizing lotteries for specific laudable objects. The policy adopted by the Government hitherto not to prosecute organizers of lotteries merely because they organize lotteries, unless fraud was detected, is the best that could be adopted.

" But all these arguments do not answer another objection raised by Mr. Sreshta that a lot of money is being drained away to other places and that something must be done to stop it. I am afraid on that matter the Local Government cannot do much. They may perhaps ask the Government of the country in which the lottery is conducted not to allow their tickets to be sold in this country. That may perhaps go far to stop the drain of money that is taking place at present."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Sir, may I say one word? I am not going to make a speech, because I certainly agree with what the hon. the Finance Member has said on this question. But on one point I have a difficulty. He said that lotteries are illegal, but even to-day I find in the papers lotteries being advertised. To mention only one case, I found in yesterday's paper a lottery for the Ahobilam temple advertised. I should like to know if really they are prohibited and, if so, how they are allowed to be advertised and conducted."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" With reference to the remarks of the hon. Member, Diwan Bahadur Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, I may make a statement now. There have been

[Sir M. Krishnan Nayar] [5th August 1932

hundreds of applications to Government for permission to run lotteries. All these applications have been invariably refused by the Government. In the case of a very few—their number is very small—when the Government were satisfied that the applicants are particularly respectable persons, what the Government have stated is this, namely, Government refuse to grant permission to conduct the lottery, but the Police will not prosecute the conductors of the lottery unless fraud is detected. Very many applications for very laudable objects such as the construction or the renovation of well-conducted schools, temples and churches have been refused. With reference to the particular instance referred to by Diwan Bahadur Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, namely, that of the Ahobilam temple, I have sent my clerk to get correct information from my office and I shall give it to him as soon as I get it. I do not think that the Government have given sanction for Ahobilam temple lottery. The policy of the Government, as I said, is invariably to refuse permission. In a small number of cases, a rider is added to the Government Order, saying that the Police will not prosecute the organizers unless fraud is detected. But that is not giving sanction."

The question was put and declared lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

1. Mr. R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
2. *Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.*
3. Mr. M. S. Sreshta.
4. Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj.
5. Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
6. Mr. K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu.
7. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanya Chetti.
8. *Mr. R. M. Palat.*
9. ,, V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar.
10. ,, A. B. Shetty.
11. ,, A. Pl. N. V. Nadimuthu Pillai.
12. ,, W. P. S. Soundara Pandian.
13. ,, D. V. Narasimhaswami.
14. ,, T. Narasa Reddi.

Noes.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur.
2. ,, *Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.*
3. ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
4. ,, Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
5. ,, *Mr. P. T. Rajan.*
6. ,, Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
7. Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
8. Mr. C. E. Jones.
9. ,, J. A. Thorne.
10. ,, H. M. Hood.
11. ,, S. H. Slater.
12. ,, *E. Conran Smith.*
13. ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
14. Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib *Bahadur.*
15. Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
16. ,, M. Devadasan.
17. ,, B. P. Sesha Reddi.
18. ,, *P. C. Moses.*
19. ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
20. ,, M. [illegible] *Muthiah Chettiyar.*
21. Mr. Daniel Thomas.
22. *Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.*
23. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
24. *Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.*
25. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
26. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
27. Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
28. Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.
29. ,, Abdul Hameed Khan.
30. ,, U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
31. ,, A. W. Hutton.
32. ,, F. J. Stanes.
33. ,, F. E. James.
34. *Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi.*
35. Mr. J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
36. *Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.*
37. Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
38. *Mr. V. T. Arasu.*
39. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
40. Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
41. *Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.*
42. Mr. G. R. Premayya.
43. ,, G. Lakshmana Reddi.

5th August 1932]

Neutral.

1. The Zamindar of Kirlampudi.
2. Mr. P. Peddi Raju.
3. Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
4. ,, K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.

Ayes 14. *Noes* 43. *Neutral* 4.

The resolution was lost.

* Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—" Mr. President, Sir, under S.O. No. 34 I move that the business of the House, viz., Resolutions Nos. 5 to 49, may be adjourned and that Resolution No. 50 regarding the honorific prefix and suffix to the names of the members of the Viswabrahmana community may be taken up now. In this connexion I have to say that Mr. Ganala Ramamurti gave notice of this resolution nearly a year ago, and unfortunately it had not been possible for the resolution being considered. This resolution has been hanging fire for the last one year. Since it was not taken up, Mr. Ramamurti has brought it once more." 4-30 p.m.
(The motion was duly seconded.)

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—" Sir, the resolutions have been ballotted and it is not right that precedence should be given to this resolution."

The motion was put and declared lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

1. Mr. M. Devadasan.
2. ,, M. S. Sreshta.
3. ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
4. ,, A. V. Bhanoji Rao.
5. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
6. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
7. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanya Chetti.
8. Mr. K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu.
9. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.
10. Mr. A. W. Hutton.
11. Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi.
12. Mr. J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
13. ,, C. Satyanarayana Choudari.
14. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
15. Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
16. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
17. Mr. W. P. A. Soundara Pandian.
18. Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
19. Mr. F. E. James.

Noes.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur.
2. ,, Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
3. ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
4. ,, Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
5. ,, Mr. P. T. Rajan.
6. ,, Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
7. Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
8. Mr. C. E. Jones.
9. Mr. J. A. Thorne.
10. ,, H. M. Hood.
11. ,, R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
12. ,, S. H. Slater.
13. ,, E. Conran Smith.
14. ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
15. Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.
16. Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
17. Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj.
18. Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
19. ,, M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.

Ayes 19. *Noes* 19.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I vote against the motion."

The motion was lost.

[Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig not being in his place when called, his resolution regarding the revision of pay and status of typists in Government service was not moved.]

CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT ORDERS REGARDING THE DISTRIBUTION OF DISCHARGED TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES IN THE CAUVERY-METTUR PROJECT AMONG THE REGULAR CIRCLES OF THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

* Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI:—"Sir, the resolution which I have the honour to move runs thus—

'*This Council recommends to the Government that G.Os. No. 2760 W., dated 3rd November 1931, and No. 939 W., dated 26th April 1932, of the Public Works and Labour Department authorizing the distribution of the temporary employees in the Cauvery-Mettur Project among the regular circles of the Public Works Department be cancelled to redress the grievance of the employees in the regular circles that their seniority and prospects are seriously affected*'.

"In the year 1925 or thereabouts, the Cauvery-Mettur Project was started; several divisions and subdivisions were formed to work out that project, and temporary establishment was recruited for these divisions and subdivisions under paragraph 56 of the Public Works Department Code. Some time after their recruitment, the members of this temporary establishment began to kick and to be alive. They complained to the Government by means of memorials that their prospects were gloomy and that they should not be allowed to be hanging on as temporary men and so they prayed that they might be distributed among the permanent Circles in the Presidency and confirmed when and as vacancies occurred. The Government, in their ultra-generosity which they sometimes exhibit ordered that the members of this temporary establishment must be distributed among the various permanent Circles in the Presidency. The orders which the Government passed are embodied in the Government Orders which I have just referred to. With your permission I shall take a cursory view of these Government Orders. G.O. No. 2760 W., dated 3rd November 1931, reads thus:—

'Memorials have been received from the temporary subordinate staff employed in Cauvery-Mettur Project requesting that they may be confirmed in permanent vacancies *in* the regular circles of the Public Works Department according to length of their service. The Government consider that the staff employed in the project should have equal opportunities of confirmation in the Public Works Department with the temporary staff employed in the circles. They accordingly direct that the temporary clerks, typists, draughtsmen and tracers employed in the project should be allotted to the circles of the Public Works Department for purposes of confirmation and that the number of temporary men in each of these classes should be distributed among circles in the proportion of the permanent strength of the circles in that class. On this principle the temporary establishment employed in the Cauvery-Mettur Project (including men discharged from the Cauvery-Mettur Project but subsequently employed by other circles) consisting of 98 temporary clerks, 12 typists, 14 draughtsmen and 7 tracers will be distributed among the circles . . .'

"The other Government Order I referred to is simply a correction of this Government Order with regard to the number of temporary clerks typists, etc. So, I need not read it. The question is, is the Government justified in passing these orders and merging the temporary

employees in regular service? The temporary establishment of the Mettur Project were recruited under the terms of paragraph 56 of the Public Works Department Code. Paragraph 56 reads thus—

'Temporary officers have no claim to pension or to any absentee allowances beyond those conditionally given to temporary employees under Fundamental Rule 103. If they are engaged for a special work, their engagement lasts only for the period during which the work lasts. If dismissed, otherwise than for serious misconduct, before the completion of the work, they will be entitled to a month's notice or a month's pay in lieu of notice; but otherwise, with or without notice, their engagement terminates when the work ends. If they desire to resign their appointments, they will be required to give a month's notice of their intention to do so or forfeit a month's pay in lieu of such notice. These conditions should be clearly explained to the men employed and a written declaration obtained from them that the terms have been clearly understood.'

"Under the terms of this paragraph a written declaration was taken from each and every member of the temporary establishment recruited for the Cauvery-Mettur Project. I shall read a line or two of the declaration that is taken under paragraph 56—

'I do hereby declare that I fully understand that my appointment as on Rs. in the Public Works Department is temporary and that my appointment carried with it no claim to pension or to any compensating allowance over and above the abovementioned salary. I have no claim whatever to any local or other allowances, etc.'

"My submission is that the members of the temporary establishment of the Cauvery-Mettur Project were informed at the time of entertainment that they could not hope for confirmation, being engaged for a special work; their employment ceases with the completion of the work. So, the service of a temporary employee of the project should terminate on the completion of the project. Hence their absorption in regular circles is against the original terms of their employment. If such absorption was harmless and does not affect the interests of others, we would have no quarrel with the Government Orders in question. On the other hand, they do affect materially the prospects of the officiating and temporary clerks of the regular circles—that is permanent establishment—who are entitled to be confirmed as and when vacancies occur. It is thus manifestly unfair and unjust to deprive the regular establishment of the circles of a privilege which they are entitled to according to the original terms of their employment and to show, at their expense, that benefit to the establishment of the Cauvery-Mettur Project who were made to understand from the very beginning that they could not lay claim to it. Moreover, as members of temporary establishments, these people in the Cauvery-Mettur Project enjoy some special privileges such as increased salaries, free housing, etc., which members of the regular services are denied. Hence, Sir, I move that G.Os. No. 2760 W., dated 3rd November 1931, and No. 939 W., dated 26th April 1932, may be cancelled. With these observations, Sir, I commend this resolution to this hon. House."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Sir, I second this motion. In doing so, I wish to state that it will be a flagrant injustice done to men in service who, according to their original appointment, expected that they would carry through according to the rules of service; but all of a sudden, the Government have decided to dump over them men who have 4-4 p.m.

been relieved from the Mettur Project. Sir, it will certainly be a grave injustice done to the men already in service if the Government do not cancel these two Government Orders referred to in the resolution so ably moved by the hon. Member from Bezwada."

Mr. C. SATYANARAYANA CHOUDARI:—" Sir, the facts disclosed by the hon. Mover of this resolution make out a very strong and serious case against the Government. The charge of breach of faith or breach of contract against the Government is too serious a charge for the Government to allow to go unnoticed. I am not sure whether the Government are in possession of any extra additional material which would enable them to explain away the case as made out by my friend Mr. Kolanda Reddi; but as facts are stated by him, I am afraid a very strong case of breach of faith on the part of Government has been made out. The case covered by the resolution, briefly put, comes to this: there are persons employed specifically for a particular purpose—the Cauvery-Mettur Project—under special conditions, on the express understanding that their term is only temporary and that it will expire on the completion of the project. The condition implied in the contract between the employees and the Government in the case of the regular services is however different, it being that unless they are guilty of some serious charge or misconduct, unless there is any policy of retrenchment necessitated by force of circumstances, every vacancy that arises in the department in which they are included should go for their benefit. Now, Sir, these are the two kinds of agreements involved in the case of these two sets of people. But contrary to the agreement implied in the case of the employees in permanent service and in gross violation of the terms, the Government have ordered that the employees recruited for the temporary establishment in connexion with the Cauvery-Mettur Project be distributed in the regular circles, with the result that the chances of confirmation and promotion of those already recruited on the basis of their entering a permanent service with prospects of confirmation, are entirely wiped out. This is a serious matter, Sir, and unless Government assure this House and through this House the public as well as the employees in the various departments that they propose to stand by the terms of the contract between them and their servants, it will lead to a sort of despair on the part of the employees in the various departments. It is not good for any Government to run the risk of losing the confidence which it ought to command at the hands of the public and of the various persons in the different departments. Under these circumstances, Sir, I hope the Government would be able to satisfy us that there is really nothing wrong in the matter, or if there is really something which ought to be rectified, to come forward and say that something has really gone wrong, and that they are prepared to set it right. Otherwise, Sir, the confidence of the public will be really shaken."

* Mr. J. A. THORNE:—" Mr. President, Sir, I am authorized to oppose this resolution on behalf of the Government. The number of persons affected by this order, that is to say, the number of persons benefited by this order, is about 120, who, by this order, are distributed over seven circles. The hon. Member who moved the resolution questioned

whether the Government Order could be justified. Another hon. Member used the terms 'breach of contract' and 'breach of faith'—somewhat serious terms which I think cannot be regarded as suitable comment on the result of this Government Order. The fact is that Government are not only justified in passing this order, but are compelled to do so by the rules issued by the Secretary of State in the year 1930 which require that all temporary posts should be regarded as temporary additions to the cadre of a service and that service in a temporary post should count as probation for admission to the service. That means that the holders of such posts are entitled to substantive appointment to the service in their turn after the completion of their probation. There are no permanent posts in the Cauvery-Mettur Project to which these temporary posts could be attached; and therefore it was necessary for the purpose of carrying out the Secretary of State's rules to distribute them among the regular circles. There is no breach of contract. It is surely not suggested that the persons already attached to the regular circles are under contracts which are affected by these orders. Nor can it be said that there is any breach of faith. Had not the Government passed this order, I have no doubt that an accusation would have been made on behalf of the temporary staff in the Cauvery-Mettur Project that Government, after having made use of them for their own purposes for a long term of years, seven or eight years, have driven them into the street at the end of their service and made no attempt whatever to provide them with any permanent occupation. If this order gave them a preference over their contemporaries in the regular circles, then the accusation of breach of faith might have some foundation. That of course is not so. These persons are attached to the regular circles and will take their turn for confirmation in the vacancies that will arise. The men already belonging to the regular circles are not superseded by them; it depends entirely on the length of service and the satisfactory termination of probation. A man in a regular circle who has, say five years' service to his credit, has so much advantage over a Cauvery-Mettur Project man who has only four years' service, and there is no question of preference of any kind to be given to the Mettur Project man. I take it that this explanation will show at any rate that the Government have no intention whatever of favouring any particular class of men. On the contrary, they have been compelled to pass this order, and the order cannot be called in question on the ground of giving preference to anybody."

Mr. C. SATYANARAYANA CHOUDARI:—"May I know what will happen in a case where the services of both are equal?"

Mr. J. A. THORNE:—"If the services are equal, I presume the case will be settled by the rules which apply to cases where the periods of service are equal." (Laughter.)

Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI:—"It is said, Sir, that under this order about 120 persons of the temporary establishment of the Cauvery-Mettur Project have been confirmed. So, are not the interests of an equal number of men in the regular service affected thereby? If these 120 men were not confirmed, certainly 120 members in the regular staff would have been confirmed." . .

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Is the hon. Member making his reply? "

Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI:—" I meant to clear my doubts, Sir."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Several other hon. Members are also anxious to speak on this motion. Therefore the House will now adjourn and meet on 31st October 1932 at 11 o'clock."

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. on the 31st October 1932.

X.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

1. [a] *Communication with reference to the answer given to clause (e) of question No.* 26 *at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on* 2*nd August* 1932.

2. [b] *G.O. No.* 901, *Development, dated* 5*th July* 1932, *recording the audit report on the accounts of the Cinchona Department, Ootacamund, for the year ending* 31*st March* 1931.

3. [c] *U.O. Note No.* 9503-2, *Public (General), dated* 25*th July* 1932, *with reference to answer to clause (a) of question No.* 1097 *given in the Legislative Council on* 23*rd March* 1932.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

[a] Printed as Appendix VI on page 416 infra.

[b] Printed separately.

[c] [illegible]

5th August 1932]

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to question No. 125 asked by Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 5th August 1932, page 337 supra.]

STATEMENT I.

Statement showing which of the Retrenchment Committee's proposals which were shown in Table C as under consideration on 1st March 1932, have been accepted up to 15th July 1932.

A. ADDITIONAL REVENUE.

Recommendations.	Remarks.
Excise—	
Abandonment of the system of granting remissions to renters for alleged loss of revenue during the currency of their leases.	
General Administration—	
Increase in the scale of fines under the Cattle Trespass Act.	The Retrenchment Committee recommended an increase of 100 per cent. The fines have been generally increased by 50 per cent.
Levy of audit fees for accounts audited by the Examiner of Local Fund Accounts.	
Administration of Justice—	
Levy of poundage on sales effected by the sheriff.	
Education—	
Raising the rate of fees in Government Arts and Professional Colleges.	
Levy of a registration fee in Government Colleges.	
Miscellaneous Departments—	
Levy of fees for tests and inspections made by the Electrical Inspector to Government.	

B. SAVINGS IN EXPENDITURE.

5. Land Revenue—	
Reduction of staff in Central Survey Office.	Staff reduced by ten clerks.
6. Excise—	
Abolition of the selection grade for Assistant Commissioners.	One selection grade post will be abolished from August 18, 1932.
8. Forest—	
Keeping in abeyance the post of Assistant Forest Utilization Officer.	
Discontinuance of the holding of Vernacular Training Schools.	
Reduction in the cadre strength of Research work to one.	
Reduction of departmental exploitation.	
9. Registration—	
Reduction in the number of Reserve Sub-Registrars from 77 to 55.	The number of Reserve Sub-Registrars was reduced to 74.
22. General Administration—	
Reduction in the number of Aides-de-Camp by one.	Reduction to be made as a temporary measure from October next.
Reduction in the strength of the Bodyguard by ten men (from 1932–33).	
Abolition of six of the posts of personal clerks and seven posts of peons attached to Members and Ministers.	One post of clerk has been kept in abeyance. The question of reducing the number of peons is under consideration.

B. Savings in Expenditure—*cont.*

Recommendations.	Remarks.
22. General Administration—*cont.*	
Reduction of the salary of Deputy President, Legislative Council.	*The Retrenchment Committee suggested* reduction to a nominal sum. Fifty per cent *voluntary surrender has been* accepted.
Decentralization of work in Revenue Department by greater delegation to the Board of Revenue and consequent reduction in establishment.	Certain powers under the Madras Abkari Act have been delegated to the Commissioner of Excise and certain others to the Board of Revenue in respect of Stamp Act.
Abolition of the temporary Budget Superintendent and two lower division clerks in the Public Works and Labour Department.	
Abolition of one peon attached to each of the Secretaries to Government.	Three posts of peons have been abolished. Further proposals are under consideration.
Madras Record Office—Concentration of work in future on mending, printing, cataloguing and indexing records *instead of the present work* of "calendaring" records.	
Gazetteers—Transfer of the work of editing gazetteers and Statistical Memoirs from the Board of Revenue to Madras Record Office and abolition of the post of Personal Assistant.	*Work of editing gazetteers transferred to* Collectors and the Personal Assistant to work under the control *of the Board of* Revenue.
Abolition of the system of printing reports of vernacular papers and issuing the reports monthly instead of weekly.	The number of copies of the reports was reduced from 80 to 48 and the weekly report has been converted into a monthly one.
Amalgamation of Madras with Chingleput.	Accepted for two years.
Abolition of Dharmavaram division.	
Abolition of the Vedasandur subtaluk in *Madura.*	
Reduction in the pay of village establishments.	Reduction accepted in respect of future incumbents.
Reduction of the special pay of Rs. 100 to Rs. 75 to the Port Officer, Mangalore, *for being in charge of* Central Coir Depot.	The 10 per cent reduction of the special pay will be continued indefinitely until a change in condition justifies a revision of the allowance.
Temporary restriction *on* the direct recruitment of Probationary Revenue Inspectors *and Deputy Tahsildars* to 50 per cent of the normal.	It *has been suggested to* abolish the system of direct recruitment of Probationary *Revenue Inspectors and* to develop the Probationary Deputy *Tahsildars system.*
24. Administration of Justice—	
Abolition of head clerks in sub-courts and replacement by routine clerks.	Abolition in respect of 12 sub-courts has so far been accepted.
Reduction of the clerical establishment of the High Court.	
Law officers—Reduction of the maximum fee allowed to pleaders engaged to defend persons accused of capital offences from Rs. 300 to Rs. 245.	
Abolition of Sub-Magistrate's Court at Tellicherry, Malabar district.	
Removal of unnecessary fans in the office of the Administrator-General and Chief Judge, Court of Small Causes.	

B. SAVINGS IN EXPENDITURE—*cont.*

Recommendations.	Remarks.
25. **Jails** and Convict Settlements—	
Closure of the Alipuram Jail, Bellary.	
26. Police—	
Reduction in the strength of the taluk police in the Agency.	
Reduction in the staff engaged on process serving duties.	
Reduction of malis in police station gardens in the city.	
30. Scientific Departments—	
Appointment of a part-time instead of a full-time Numismatic Assistant in the Government Museum.	
Discontinuance of the donations to Bhandarkhar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.	
Formation of an Electricity Board ..	The question to be considered when State enterprise reaches as a further degree of development.
31. Education—	
Abolition of the Philosophy and Sanskrit departments in the Presidency College.	Philosophy department abolished. One post of Madras Educational Service in the Sanskrit department converted into one of Subordinate Educational Service.
Abolition of the Philosophy department and Forms IV to VI in the Victoria College, Palghat.	
Revision of the scale of remuneration given to the part-time lecturers in the Law College, Madras.	
Conversion of one Madras Educational Service post into a Subordinate Service post and keeping in abeyance the post of one Laboratory Assistant and one attender in the Engineering College.	
Closure of the Vizagapatam Engineering School.	
Abolition of 50 School Assistants in Government Training Schools.	
Abolition of the Government Commercial Schools in Calicut, Vizagapatam and Madras.	The school at Madras to continue till 30th April 1933 with minimum staff.
Replacement of one of the two clerks in each Assistant and Sub-Assistant Inspectresses' office by an attender.	One post of clerk in each office was abolished and a peon's post in each was converted into that of an attender.
Abolition of two District Educational Officers by amalgamating the Ceded districts into two charges.	
Suspension of the grants for medical inspection.	
Discontinuance of the subsidy paid to temporary secondary training classes attached to aided secondary schools.	
Abolition of the temporary peripatetic music teacher and one peon under European schools.	
32. Medical—	
Gradual abolition of the Tanjore Medical School.	
Reduction by 19 in the number of stipends to midwifery pupils in the Government Hospital for Women and Children.	The number was reduced by 15.

[5th August 1932

B. SAVINGS IN EXPENDITURE—*cont.*

Recommendations.	Remarks.
32. Medical—*cont.*	
Reduction in the value of stipends to pupil-midwives from Rs. 45 and Rs. 35 to Rs. 25 and Rs. 20.	Value of stipends was reduced from Rs. 35 to Rs. 30 in the case of future stipendiaries. The stipends of pupil-nurses were reduced by Rs. 5.
Stoppage of recruitment of Sub-Assistant Surgeons in such a way as to enable the number of private medical practitioners to be increased to 50 per cent as against the present 25 per cent.	Government have sanctioned the withdrawal of all Government Sub-Assistant Surgeons employed in local fund medical institutions other than those at taluk headquarters and Dhanushkodi gradually as vacancies occur in Government cadre and employment of private medical practitioners in their places.
Abolition of the post of Assistant to the Professor of Medical Jurisprudence in Medical College, and Lecturer in Medical Jurisprudence in the Medical School, Rayapuram, and the creation of a full-time professor.	
33. Public Health—	
Reduction in the rank of the Sanitary Engineer to that of an Executive Engineer and Deputy Sanitary Engineers to that of Assistant Engineers.	Two posts of Deputy Sanitary Engineers have been abolished.
34. Agriculture—	
Abolition of the posts of Systematic Botanist and Assistant Entomologist.	
Abolition of the post of Personal Assistant to the Principal, Agricultural College.	The Personal Assistant to the Principal was replaced by an Accountant.
Abolition of the post of Headquarters Deputy Director.	Instead of the Headquarters Deputy Director, the post of Personal Assistant to the Director of Agriculture has been abolished.
Reduction of the number of Deputy Directors by four with corresponding reduction in establishment.	Two District Agricultural Officers were abolished in lieu of Deputy Directors.
Closure of livestock research stations with resultant abolition of two gazetted assistants.	Orders issued to close the Chintaladevi farm and the buffalo station at Guntur and to abolish the post of Superintendent, Livestock, Chintaladevi.
Amalgamation of the posts of Research Engineer in the Agricultural and Industries Department—Half cost.	
Replacement of two or three gazetted assistants to research officers by upper subordinates.	One post of Superintendent in the Madras Agricultural Service has been abolished.
Veterinary—	
Restriction in the recruitment of Veterinary Assistant Surgeons so as to reduce the permanent strength to 75 per cent of the present cadre.	
Opening of a serum institute.	
Co-operative credit—	
Abolition of the post of one Deputy Registrar (Labour department) and staff.	
Abolition of the staff employed under the Deputy Registrar, Ramnad Circle.	

B. SAVINGS IN EXPENDITURE—*cont.*

Recommendations.	Remarks.
35. Industries—	
Abolition of certain posts in the School of Arts and Crafts.	
Industrial Schools and Trades Schools, Calicut, Bellary and Mangalore—Reduction in net expenditure.	
Industrial Institute, Madura—Restriction to educational purposes only.	
Closure of the Madras Industrial Institute.	
Abolition of two weaving parties and one dyeing party.	
Amalgamation of the posts of Research Engineer in the Industrial and Agricultural departments—Half cost.	
37. Miscellaneous Departments—	
Delegation of powers to Collectors to sanction activities of all kinds connected with labour.	
46. Stationery and Printing—	
Imposing greater responsibility on individual departments for expenditure on printing and stationery.	
Restriction of overtime work in the Government Press.	The extension of Mint Buildings and the installation of new machinery are expected to reduce expenditure on overtime.
Appointment of stationery stock verifier to reduce waste in subsidiary offices.	
Administration reports—Discontinuance of the practice of printing subsidiary administration reports and unnecessary statistics and reducing the dimensions of the reports.	The recommendation is being given effect to wherever possible.
Discontinuance of the publication of College Calendars.	Do.
Departmental lists—Publication every six months instead of every quarter.	Do.
Curtailment and restriction of free supply and distribution of Government publications.	Do.
Restriction on printing at private presses.	Do.
Departmental lists—Publication in the same form as the combined Civil List.	Do.
Expenditure Common to all Departments—Reduction or abolition of special pays and compensatory allowances in some cases.	Orders have been issued on many of the items; others are under consideration.

STATEMENT II.

Statement showing the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee which were rejected up to 1st March 1932 (vide Table D, Appendix III of the Report) and from 1st March 1932 to 15th July 1932 together with the financial value of the recommendations and the reasons for rejecting them.

[NOTE.—Items with an asterisk are those which are rejected up to 1st March 1932.]

A. ADDITIONAL REVENUE.

Recommendation of the Committee.	Financial effect in a full year.	Reasons why rejected.
	LAKHS.	
VI. Excise—		
Grant of licences for foreign liquor shops by a system of calling for tenders instead of charging fixed fees.	Not known.	Not workable.
XXII. Medical—		
* Levy of half fees for women students ..	·03	Not desirable in the public interests.
XXIV. Veterinary—		
Levy of a small fee (say 4 annas) for each inoculation wherever possible.	·03	Do.
XXVI. Miscellaneous Departments—		
Levy of a small fee for inspection of factories.	Not known.	Do.
XXX. Civil Works—		
* Withdrawal of the concession of rent-free quarters and free supply of electric energy for the Government House staff.	·27	Do.
* Withdrawal of the concession of rent-free quarters from the personnel of the Saluting Battery at Ootacamund.	·001	Do.

B. SAVINGS IN EXPENDITURE.

Recommendation of the Committee.	Financial effect in a full year.	Reasons why rejected.
6. Excise—		
* Abolition of—		
One Deputy Commissioner and establishments. One Territorial Assistant Commissioner.	·49	Weakening of the supervising staff will lead to decline in revenue.
* Reduction of the post of Secretary to the Commissioner of Excise from the rank of Assistant Commissioner to that of a Senior Inspector.	·03	Not desirable in public interests.
8. Forest—		
* Abolition of the post of Forest Assistant to the Chenchu Officer.	·03	Do.
Restricting the number of divisions to 29 as against the proposed 31 in the recent reorganization.	·20	Do.
22. General Administration—		
* Abolition of the Musiri division in Trichinopoly and the sub-taluks of Narasaraopetta, Mangalagiri, Virudhunagar and Hosdrug.	·26	Do.
Reduction in the strength of the Cabinet by one.	·75	Unnecessary at present.

B. SAVINGS IN EXPENDITURE—*cont.*

Recommendation of the Committee.	Financial effect in a full year.	Reasons why rejected.
22. General Administration—*cont.*		
	LAKHS.	
Abolition of the posts of Superintendent, Local Self-Government and Public Works and Labour Departments.	·04	Not desirable in public interests.
Move of Government to the hills to be limited to one stay of four months.	·20	Do.
Abolition of Dhone division by transferring Pattikonda taluk to Bellary.	·08	Do.
Abolition of Anantapur district	·16	Do.
Amalgamation of the Nilgiris district with Coimbatore.	·40	The time is not opportune for the amalgamation.
Amalgamation of the West Godavari and Kistna districts.	·40	Not desirable in public interests.
Abolition of 3 sub-taluks, Tirur in Malabar and Tranquebar and Valangiman in Tanjore.	·12	Do.
Abolition of the communal returns and one Upper division clerk in the Chief Secretariat.	·01	Do.
Revision of the rates of exchange of rice and coir in Laccadives and Amindivis.	Not known.	Not necessary.
24. Administration of Justice—		
* Abolition of the District Munsif's Court, Madura.	·11	Not desirable in the public interest.
* Abolition of the Sub-Court at Negapatam ..	·17	Do.
* Abolition of the Sub-Court at Chittoor and the retention of the Sub-Court at Vellore.	·15	Do.
* Abolition of the Sub-Magistrate's Court at Coondapoor and Karkal in South Kanara district.	·05	Do.
Reduction in the present period of vacation in all Courts including the High Court by a fortnight.	Not known.	Neither necessary nor desirable.
Reduction in the number of copies of judgments and calendars that are now being submitted to District Magistrates.	Do.	Not desirable in the public interest.
Increasing the number of Honorary Presidency Magistrates empowered to sit singly and reducing the number of stipendiary Presidency Magistrates by one.	Do.	It is not desirable in the public interest to reduce the number of stipendiary Presidency Magistrates. The question of increasing the number of Honorary Presidency Magistrates sitting singly is under consideration.
26. Police—		
Replacement of the District Superintendent of Police at Koraput by an Assistant Superintendent of Police.	·04	Not desirable in public interests.
Replacement of both of the Railway District Superintendents of Police by Assistant Superintendents of Police.	·08	Not practicable.
Substitution of two head constables for two sergeants in the traffic staff in the City.	·03	Do.

B. SAVINGS IN EXPENDITURE—*cont.*

Recommendation of the Committee.	Financial effect in a full year.	Reasons why *rejected.*
	LAKHS.	
31. Education—		
* Reduction in the rates of boarding grants for European Secondary Schools.	·25	Not desirable.
Abolition of the Government Arts College at Rajahmundry and the College Department of the Brennen College, Tellicherry.	·28	Do.
Abolition of the Sanskrit department in the Presidency College.	·08	Do.
32. Medical—		
Abolition of the post of Assistant Professor of Bio-Chemistry in the Vizagapatam Medical College.	·05	Not desirable in public interests.
* Abolition of the posts of Lecturer and Assistant Lecturer in Chemistry in the Rayapuram Medical School.	·04	Do.
Appointment of a cheaper agency by training a local man to take the place of the Chemical Examiner.	Not known.	Do.
33. Public Health—		
* Abolition of two posts of Assistant Director of Public Health.	·23	Do.
* Abolition of the post of six Assistant District Health Officers.	·16	Do.
* Provincialization of the staff of Agency Vaccinators in return for the transfer of education to the Agency Local Board.	·12	Do.
* Abolition of the posts of Rural Sanitation Officer and the Propaganda Officer, and reduction in the allotment for expenses connected with health propaganda by 50 per cent.	·35	Do.
* Substitution of quinine febrifuge for quinine.	Not known.	Do.
Appointment of a cheaper agency by training a local man to take the place of the Public Analyst.	Do.	Do.
34. Agriculture—		
Abolition of the post of Statistical Assistant and Assistant Chemist.	·15	Do.
Veterinary. Introduction of a simpler form of mortality returns (of infectious diseases only) to the Veterinary department.	Not known.	Change in existing system not necessary nor desirable.
Co-operative credit—		
* Abolition of the post of Joint Registrar of Co-operative Societies.	·19	Not desirable in the public interests.
* Employment of routine in place of inspector-clerks.	·17	Do.
* Modification of the recommendation about the revision of pay of Sub-Deputy Registrars, with regard to four Sub-Deputy Registrars in independent charge.	·01	Do.
* Withdrawal of subsidies to Training Institutes (one accepted).	·09	Do.
35. Industries—		
Abolition of the post of Ceramic Assistant ..	·05	Do.
Abolition of the Deputy Director's post ..	·14	Do.
Cinchona—Direct purchase of the outturn of the factory instead of through the Government of India Medical Stores Department at	Not known.	Do.

B. SAVINGS IN EXPENDITURE—*cont.*

Recommendation of the Committee.	Financial effect in a full year.	Reasons why rejected.
	LAKHS.	
35. Fisheries—		
Reduction of 20 per cent in the amount of compensation paid to local bodies for inland fisheries.	·13	Not desirable in the public interests.
Adjustment of the price of salt so as to balance revenue and expenditure.	·85	Do.
37. Miscellaneous Departments—		
* Vital Statistics—Abolition of 25 clerks employed in Collectors' offices.	·15	Do.
* Transfer of labour functions of the Commissioner of Labour to other officers.	Not known.	Do.
* Transfer of Criminal Tribes Settlements either to the Inspector-General of Prisons or to Collectors.	..	Do.
41. Civil Works—		
Further restriction of allotment for works of all kinds keeping the minimum at Rs. 44 (*plus* 108) 152 lakhs.	5·68	No further action was considered necessary.
46. Stationery and Printing—		
Curtailment and restriction of free supply and distribution of Government publications (Supply of departmental administration reports to Members of Legislative Councils).	Not known.	A conference of leaders of the parties in the Council was not in favour of any restriction.
Common to all departments—		
Reduction or abolition of—		
* (*a*) Special pays.	·04	
* (*b*) Compensatory allowances.	·36	

STATEMENT III.

Department. (1)	Budget estimate, 1931–32. (2)	Effect in 1932–33 of Retrenchment Committee's recommendations accepted. (3)	Percentage of [columns (3) to (2)]. (4)
	LAKHS.	LAKHS.	PER CENT.
A. Retrenchment by major heads—			
Land Revenue	29·08	7·91	27·2
Excise	40·51	2·28	5·6
Stamps	6·59	·51	7·8
Forest	44·73	3·27	7·3
Registration	30·36	2·01	6·6
Irrigation	112·89	6·54	5·8
General administration	282·94	7·52	2·6
Administration of Justice ..	100·68	3·65	3·6
Jails and Convict Settlements ..	29·27	4·67	15·9
Police	176·40	7·02	3·9

[5th August 1932

Statement III—*contd.*

Department. (1)	Budget estimate, 1931–32. (2)	Effect in 1932–33 of Retrenchment Committee's recommendations accepted. (3)	Percentage of [columns (3) to (2)]. (4)
	LAKHS.	LAKHS.	PER CENT.
A. Retrenchment by major heads—*cont.*			
Ports and Pilotage	·29	·02	6·9
Scientific departments	2·71	·37	13·6
Education	264·77	20·23	7·6
Medical	94·75	4·80	5·1
Public Health	40·85	10·55	25·8
Agriculture, Veterinary and Co-operative Credit.	45·05	4·57	10·1
Industries and Fisheries	21·15	4·07	19·2
Labour and other miscellaneous departments.	76·81	4·45	5·7
Civil Works	218·34	29·00	13·3
Famine	1·00	·75	75·0
Pensions	79·84	2·20	2·7
Stationery and Printing	23·57	1·63	6·9
Miscellaneous	4·21	·11	2·6
B. Expenditure common to several major heads, and not included in list A (above)—			
(*a*) Special pays	..	·91	..
(*b*) Compensatory allowance ..	..	·47	..
(*c*) Travelling allowance including Fixed Travelling allowance.	..	8·80	..
(*d*) Contingencies and supplies and services.	..	8·29	..
Total ..	1,726·79	146·60	..

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 128 asked by Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 5th August 1932, page 338, supra.]

Members of Text-book Committee, Madras.

PRESIDENT:

Mr. R. Littlehailes (*Ex-officio*).

Nominated Members.

1. E. W. Green, Esq., B.A., Principal, Government Muhammadan College, Madras.
2. R. M. Statham, Esq., M.A., C.I.E., Principal, Presidency College, Madras.
3. Miss T. H. Lowe, M.SC., F.G.S., Inspectress of Girls' Schools, VI Circle, Coimbatore.
4. M.R.Ry. T. Suryanarayana Garu, B.A. (Cantab.), Additional Professor of Applied Mathematics, Presidency College, Madras.
5. Mrs. K. G. Martin, B.A., L.T., Assistant Inspectress of Girls' Schools, Madras Girls' Range, Madras.
6. M.R.Ry. V. P. Achuta Menon Avargal, B.A., L.T., Headmaster, Government School of Commerce, Calicut.
7. C. R. Porrett, Esquire, Adviser to Government on Vocational Education and Manual Training, Teachers' College, Saidapet.
8. M.R.Ry. M. Kandaswami Mudaliyar Avargal, B.A., M.R.A.S., Lecturer in Tamil and Superintendent of Studies in Indian Languages, Pachaiyappa's College, Madras.
9. ,, T. Rajagopala Rao Garu, B.A., L.T., Lecturer in Telugu and Superintendent of Vernacular Studies, Madras Christian College, Madras.
10. ,, P. P. Sankaran Nambiyar Avargal, M.A., L.T., Lecturer, Ceded Districts College, Anantapur.
11. ,, K. A. Nilakanta Sastriar Avargal, M.A., Professor of History, University of Madras, "Limbdi Gardens", Royapetta, Madras.
12. Miss C. Gordon, Kindergarten Lecturer, Teachers' College, Saidapet.
13. Moulvi Muhammad Abdul Huq Sahib Bahadur, M.A. (Afzul-ul-Ulama), Professor of Arabic, Government Muhammadan College, Madras.
14. Abdul Hamid Sahib Bahadur, M.A., District Educational Officer, South Malabar, Calicut.
15. M.R.Ry. K. S. Appaswami Ayyar Avargal, B.A., L.T., District Educational Officer, West Godavari, Ellore.
16. ,, C. S. Srinivasachariar Avargal, M.A., Professor, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar, Chidambaram.
17. ,, Rao Bahadur M. C. S. Anantapadmanabha Rao Avargal, M.A., L.T., Retired Principal, Government College, Kumbakonam, now at "Station View", Bikshandar Koil, Trichinopoly.

[5th August 1932

Nominated Members—cont.

18. M.R.Ry. L. T. Anantanarayana Sastriar Avargal, Retired Headmaster, School of Commerce, Calicut, now at Chalapuram.
19. Sriman Sivaram Ratho Mahasayo, B.A., L.T., District Educational Officer, Berhampur, Ganjam district.
20. ,, Madhusudan Maha Patro Mahasayo, B.A. (Kavyateertha), Principal, Rajah's Sanskrit College, Parlakimedi, Ganjam district.
21. Dr. M. Karamchand, M.A., PH.D., Professor, Government College, Coimbatore.
22. M.R.Ry. Vidwan R. Raghava Ayyangar Avargal, Ramnad Samasthanam, Ramnad.

Members elected by the District Secondary Education Boards.

1. Sriman Madan Mohan Ratho Mahasayo, B.A., L.T., Headmaster, Board High School, Chatrapur, Ganjam district.
2. M.R.Ry. S. V. Rama Das Pantulu Garu, B.A., L.T., Headmaster, Secondary Department, Maharaja's College, Vizianagram.
3. ,, K. Sundaramayya Garu, B.A., L.T., Headmaster, Board High School, Samalkot, East Godavari.
4. ,, Kotaru Rama Rao Garu, M.A., L.T., Headmaster, S.K.P.V.V. Hindu High School, Bezwada.
5. ,, T. V. Apparsundara Mudaliyar Avargal, M.A., L.T., District Educational Officer, South Arcot, Cuddalore.
6. ,, V. Guruswami Sastri Avargal, B.A., L.T., Headmaster, High School, Tirukattupalli, Tanjore district.
7. ,, S. K. Deivasikamani Avargal, B.A., L.T., Headmaster, Bishop Heber College High School, Trichinopoly.
8. ,, M. Venkatarama Sastri Avargal, B.A., L.T., Retired Headmaster, Sethupathi High School, Madura, No. 87, North Masi Street, Madura.
9. ,, G. Damodara Mudaliyar Avargal, B.A., L.T., District Educational Officer, Ramnad at Madura.
10. ,, J. Anbudaiyan Avargal, B.A., L.T., Headmaster, C.M. High School, Tinnevelly.
11. ,, B. N. Sangameswara Ayyar Avargal, M.A., L.T., Assistant, High School Department, Salem College, Salem.
12. Mrs. C. Chinnammu Mannadissiar, B.A., Headmistress, Board Moyan Girls' High School, Palghat.
13. M.R.Ry. A. Srinivasa Pai Avargal, B.A., B.L., President, Secondary Education Board, South Kanara, Mangalore.
14. ,, D. Venkatasubbayya Garu, B.A., L.T., Headmaster, V.R. College School, Nellore.
15. ,, J. Seshadri Sarma Garu, Telugu Pandit, Municipal High School, Cuddapah.
16. ,, A. S. Venkatarama Ayyar Avargal, B.A., L.T., Assistant, Board High School, Chittoor.
17. Vacant—(Coimbatore district).

5th August 1932]

APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to question No. 134 asked by Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 5th August 1932, page 344, supra.]

Appendix (i).

Statement of Annual Expenditure on the Livestock Section from 1919–20 to 1931–32.

Year.	Expenditure. RS.
1919–20	45,073
1920–21	46,703
1921–22	63,695
1922–23	54,005
1923–24	97,885
1924–25	1,53,164
1925–26	1,48,383
1926–27	1,66,161
1927–28	1,92,691
1928–29	1,94,332
1929–30	2,08,397
1930–31	2,10,373
1931–32	1,73,596

Appendix (ii).

Statement of sums expended from the year 1921–22 to 1931–32 on account of premimum for the maintenance of the breeding bulls.

Year.	Amount. RS.
1921–22	100
1922–23	300
1923–24	475
1924–25	300
1925–26	822
1926–27	540
1927–28	550
1928–29	950
1929–30	2,225
1930–31	3,070
1931–32	4,391

APPENDIX IV.

[Vide answer to question No. 137 asked by Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 5th August 1932, page 345, supra.]

Extracts of paragraphs 152 and 153 of the Civil Veterinary Manual.

Paragraph 152.—The Touring Veterinary Assistant Surgeons of the districts bordering on the Indian States of Hyderabad, Mysore, Travancore and Cochin are required to compile on the first of each month a statement showing the villages in the taluks bordering on these States which are affected with rinderpest and forward it to the Director, Civil Veterinary Department, Hyderabad, or the Superintendent, Mysore Civil Veterinary Department, Bangalore, or the Director of Agriculture and Fisheries, Travancore, or the Superintendent, Veterinary Department, Cochin State, as the case may be and a copy of it to the District Veterinary Officer. A 'nil' statement should be submitted when no village is affected.

Paragraph 153.—The same Touring Veterinary Assistant Surgeons will be furnished with a similar statement in respect of the taluks of the four Indian States mentioned in the previous paragraph which border on this Presidency. On receipt of information that rinderpest exists in a neighbouring taluk, a Veterinary Assistant Surgeon should endeavour to visit the part of the Madras Presidency most concerned, warn the ryots and village officers, and take what other measures are possible to prevent the spread of the contagion. If the Veterinary Assistant Surgeon himself is unable to visit the tract most concerned he should ask the Tahsildar to warn his village officers of the near existence of the disease and advise the ryots not to allow their animals to come in contact with those of the Indian State.

APPENDIX V.

[Vide answer to question No. 140 asked by Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 5th August 1932, page 347 supra.]

I

Statement showing grants for recurring objects and total expenditure under ' Ordinary '.

Clauses (*a*) and (*b*)—

Name of the taluk board.		1927–28.		1928–29.		1929–30.		1930–31.		1931–32 (Revised estimate).	
		Grant.	Expenditure.	Grant.	Expenditure.	Grant.	Expenditure.	Grant.	Expenditure.	Grant.	Expenditure.
		RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
Tindivanam	..	80,094	1,15,834	1,03,672	1,20,045	1,09,493	1,43,912	1,18,053	1,64,911	1,38,780	2,01,560
Tirukkoyilur	..	87,428	1,13,718	1,03,888	1,20,354	1,22,213	1,26,701	1,31,026	1,39,286	1,26,840	1,42,690
Chidambaram	..	47,090	78,658	50,800	76,138	49.988	73,072	51.494	77,874	52,440	83,720

II

Grants given for the opening of new elementary schools for Muhammadan boys and girls.

Elementary schools for boys.		Elementary schools for girls.	
Year.	Amount of subsidy.	Year in which grant was sanctioned.	Amount of subsidy.
		Chidambaram.	
1927–28 to 1931–32	Nil.	1927–28 to 1928–29	Nil.
		1929–30	Rs. 348 per annum (amount sanctioned in 1929–30 was Rs. 303).
		1930–31, 1931–32	Nil.
		Tirukkoyilur.	
1927–28 & 1928–29	Nil.	1927–28 to 1928–29	Nil.
1929–30	Rs. 300 per annum (amount sanctioned in 1929–30 was Rs. 275).	1929–30	Rs. 348 per annum (amount sanctioned in 1929–30 was Rs. 303).
1930–31, 1931–32	Nil.	1930–31, 1931–32	Nil.
		Tindivanam.	
1927–28 to 1931–32	Nil.	1927–28 to 1931–32	Nil.

NOTE.—No subsidies were sanctioned in the years 1927–28, 1928–29 and 1931–32 for the opening of new Muhammadan elementary schools under local bodies.

APPENDIX VI.

[Vide Item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 400 supra.]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

PAPER TO BE PLACED ON THE TABLE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

With reference to the answer given to clause (*e*) of question No. 26 at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 2nd August 1932, it has since been ascertained that most of the men employed on test works in Bellary are earning wages at the following rates:—

Workers.	Rate of wages. RS.	A.	P.
Special class (i.e., gangmen or special gangs) ...	0	2	7
Class I (adults employed on digging, etc.) ...	0	2	1
Class II (adults employed on carrying, etc.) ...	0	1	8
Class III (children)	0	1	3

J. A. THORNE,
Secretary to Government.

APPENDIX VII

[Vide Item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House page 400 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. NOTE No. 9503-2, DATED THE 25TH JULY 1932.

With reference to the answer to clause (a) of Question No. 1097 given in the Legislative Council on the 23rd March 1932 the following statement is laid on the table of the House :—

Civil Disobedience Movement, 1932—List of persons who apologized and were let off.

Serial number and district.	Court and case number.	Name of accused.	Sections of prosecution.	Reasons for with-drawal.
1. Madras ..	Presidency Magistrate's Court, 3178/32	Kuppuswami Nayudu ..	17 (1), C.L.A.A.	Apology.
2. Do. ..	Do.	Gopala Ayyar	Do.	Do.
3. Do. ..	9370/32	Fazallulla Sahib	4 of Ord. V. ..	Do.
4. Do. ..	9824/32	Dhana Singh Nayudu ..	17 (1), C.L.A.A. and 143, I.P.C.	Do.
5. Do. ..	Do.	M. K. Sabapathi Mudali ..	Do.	Do.
6. Do. ..	Do.	K. S. Govindarajulu ..	Do.	Do.
7. Do. ..	Do.	P. Muruga Mudali	Do.	Do.
8. Do. ..	Do.	M. Muthuswami Pillai ..	Do.	Do.
9. Do. ..	Do.	B. Ramayya Chetti ..	Do.	Do.
10. Do. ..	10183/32	K. Raman Pillai	143, I.P.C. ..	Do.
11. Do. ..	Do.	M. Venugopal Padayachi ..	Do. ..	Do.
12. Do. ..	Do.	S. Kuppuswami	Do. ..	Do.
13. Do. ..	Do.	N. A. Pattu	Do. ..	Do.
14. Do. ..	Do.	M. Subramani	Do ..	Do.
15. Do. ..	Do.	N. Venkatachalam	Do. ..	Do.
16. Do. ..	9824/32	A. R. Rajagopal	17 (1), C.L.A.A. and 143, I.P.C.	Do.
17. Do. ..	Do.	N. M. Sundaram Ayyar ..	Do.	Do.
18. Do. ..	Do.	S. Krishna Mudali	Do.	Do.
19. Do. ..	Do.	M. Murugappa Asari ..	Do.	Do.
20. Do. ..	Do.	N. Krishnaswami Pillai ..	Do.	Do.
21. Do. ..	Commissioner of Police and Crime 195/32	C. Venkatarangam Nayudu.	17 (1), C.L.A.A.	On information that he was not likely to take further part in civil disobedience.
22. Do. ..	216/32	M. P. Guruswami Nayudu..	17 (1), C.L.A.A	Apology.
23. Do. ..	397/32	K. S. Gopalakrishnan ..	Do.	Do.
24. Do. ..	Do.	Raghunatha Rao	Do.	Do.
25. Do. ..	Do.	V. Subba Rao	Do.	Do.
26. Do. ..	Do.	Chinnaswami Ayyar ..	Do.	Do.
27. Do. ..	Do.	Murugesa Pillai	Do.	Do.
28. Do. ..	414/32	Rangaswami	Do.	Do
29. Do. ..	Do.	Kandaswami Chetti ..	Do.	Do.
30. Do. ..	Do.	Kamalanathan	Do.	Do.
31. Do. ..	Do.	Namasivayam	Do.	Do.

[5th August 1932

Civil Disobedience Movement, 1932—List of persons who apologized and were let off—*cont.*

Serial number and district.	Court and case number.	Name of accused.	Sections of prosecution.	Reasons for withdrawal.
32. Madras ..	Commissioner of Police and Crime, 415/32	C. Muniswami	17 (1), C.L.A.A.	Apology.
33. Do. ..	Do.	V. A. Kuppuswami ..	Do.	Do.
34. Do. ..	Do.	Venkatasan	Do.	Do.
35. Do. ..	474/32	A. Adikesavulu	Do.	Do.
36. Do. ..	Do.	V. K. Nagayya	Do.	Do.
37. Do. ..	537/32	Venkataramayya Choudry ..	Do.	Do.
38. Do. ..	570/32	S. Iswarayya	Do.	Do
39. Do. ..	581/32	T. P. Srinivasan	Do.	Do.
40. Do. ..	686/32	Tiruvenkata Nayakan ..	Do.	Do.
41. Do. ..	721/32	Kuberayya	Do.	Do.
42. Do. ..	727/32	Ramaswami Nayudu ..	Do.	Do.
43. Do. ..	742/32	Kannivelu Pillai	Do.	Do.
44. Do. ..	Do.	Krishnamurti Nayudu ..	Do.	Do.
45. Do. ..	757/32	Irusareddi	Do.	Do.
46. Do. ..	756/32	Logan	Do.	Do.
47. Do. ..	Do.	Narayanaswami	Do.	Do.
48. Do. ..	Do.	T. M. Ponnambalam ..	Do.	Do.
49. Do. ..	Do.	Dakshinamurti	Do.	Do.
50. Do. ..	759/32	Syed Gaffur	18 (1), Cr.L.A.A.	Do.
51. Do. ..	761/32	R. Radhakrishnan	17 (1), Cr.L.A.A.	Do.
52. Do. ..	897/32	C. Muthuswami Nayudu ..	Do.	Do.
53. Bellary ..	Police C.R. 18/32	K. Srinivasachar	4 of Ord. V. ..	Undertaking not to take part in civil disobedience movement.
54. Chittoor ..	Subdivisional Magistrate, C.C. 4/32	K. S. Vittal Rao	17 (1), Cr.L.A.A.	Apology.
55. Do. ..	Do.	C. S. Sundararajan	Do.	Do.
56. Do. ..	C.C. 5/32	C. Gundu Rao	17 (2), Cr.L.A.A.	Do.
57. Do. ..	Do.	K. Muniswami Chetti alias Appukutti.	Do.	Do.
58. Do. ..	Do.	G. Muniswami Chetti ..	Do.	Do.
59. Do. ..	Do	M. Ramachandran	Do.	Do.
60. Coimbatore.	Subdivisional Magistrate, Erode, 20/32	S. D. Thirupati Nayudu ..	4 of Ord. V ..	Do.
61. Ganjam ..	Subdivisional Magistrate, Chicacole, 16/32	Malladi Venkatakrishna Sarma.	17 (2), Cr.L.A.A.	494, Cr.P.C.
62. Do. ..	Do.	Jaditala Rama Doss ..	188, I.P.C. ..	
63. West Godavari.	Subdivisional Magistrate, Bhimavaram, 9/32	Y. Kanaka Raju	17 (1), Cr.L.A.A.	249, Cr.P.C.
64. Do.	12/32	B. Rangar Raju	Do.	Do.
65. Kistna ..	Joint Magistrate, Bezwada, C.C. 231/32	Nirukonda Kotayya ..	157 and 109, I.P.C., with 8 of Ord. III of 1932.	Apology.
66 Do. ..	Subdivisional Magistrate of Gudivada, C.C.	Koduru Ramachandra Rao ..	157, I.P.C. ..	Do.

5th August 1932]

Civil Disobedience Movement, 1932—List of persons who apologized and were let off—*cont.*

Serial number and district.	*Court and case number.*	Name of accused.	Sections of prosecution.	Reasons for withdrawal.
67. Malabar ..	Subdivisional Magistrate, Tellicherry, C.C. 62/32	Arippadiyan *alias* Koonakaran Raman.	143, I.P.C. ..	Apology.
68. Do. ..	Do.	Keloth Sekharan	Do. ..	Do.
69. Do. ..	64/32	K. M. P. Kunhiraman Nambiyar.	17 (1), Crl.L.A. A.	Do.
70. Do. ..	Subdivisional Magistrate, Palghat.	O. Neelakantan Nambudiri.	143, 188 and 117, I.P.C.	Do.
71. Do. ..	Do.	Pulinazhi Illath Subrahmanyan Nambudiri.	188 (2), I.P.C., and 18 (1) of Act XXIII/31.	Do.
72. Nellore ..	Subdivisional Magistrate.	Mulamudi Jagannadha Rao.	17 (1), Crl.L.A. A. and 4 of Ord. V/32.	Do.
73. Ramnad ..	Joint Magistrate, Sivakasi, 44/32	Ramaswami Reddi	4 of Ord. V/32.	Do.
74. Do. ..	48/32	Meenappan Chetti	17 (1), Crl.L.A. A.	Do
75. Do. ..	Do.	Ramalingam Chetti	Do.	Do.
76 Do. ..	51/32	Ponnayya Chetti	4 of Ord. V/32.	Do.
77. Do. ..	66/32	Guruswami Pillai	Do.	Do.
78. Do. ..	72/32	Narayana Reddi	17 (1), Crl.L.A. A.	Do.
79. Salem ..	Stationary Sub-Magistrate, Dharmapuri, 59/32	D. B. Pachiappa Chetti *alias* Doraiswami Chetti.	188, I.P.C. ..	Do.
80. Tanjore ..	Stationary Sub-Magistrate, Tiruturaipundi, 32/32	Balakrishna Nayudu ..	147, 149, 342 and 427, I.P.C.	Do.
81. Do. ..	Do.	Ramakrishna Thevar ..	Do.	Do.
82. Do. ..	Do.	Ramanatha Thevar	Do.	Do.
83. Do. ..	Do.	Shanmuga Thevar	Do.	Do.
84. Do. ..	Do.	Kolandaivelu	Do.	Do.
85. Do. ..	Do.	Ammasi	Do.	Do.
86. Do. ..	Do.	Kothan Vaickaran	Do.	Do.
87. Do. ..	Do.	Packiri Vaickaran	Do.	Do.
88. Do. ..	Stationary Sub-Magistrate, Tiruturaipundi, 25/32	Pattu Ayyangar	143, 341 and 506, I.P.C.	Do.
89. Do. ..	Do.	Narayanaswami Tevar ..	Do.	Do.
90. Do. ..	Do.	Meenakshisundaram Pillai ..	Do.	Do.
91. Do. ..	Do.	Kanniah Pillai	Do.	Do.
92. Do. ..	Do.	Dharmaraja Pillai	Do.	Do.
93. Do. ..	Do.	Damodaram Pillai	Do.	Do.
94. Do. ..	Do.	Muruga Padayachi	Do.	Do.
95. Do. ..	Do.	Packiriswami Pillai ..	Do.	Do.
96. Do. ..	Do.	Rajagopala Pillai	Do.	Do.
97. Do. ..	Do.	Ahamadsa Ravuttar ..	Do.	Do.
98. Do. ..	Do.	Nagaraja Pathar	Do.	Do.
99. Do. ..	Do.	Sinnayya Servai	Do.	Do.
100. Do. ..	Do.	Muthuswami	Do.	Do.

[5th August 1932

Civil Disobedience Movement, 1932—List of persons who apologized and were let off—*cont.*

Serial number and district.	Court and case number.	Name of accused.	Sections of prosecution.	Reasons for withdrawal.
101. Tanjore ..	Stationary Sub-Magistrate, Tiruturaipundi, 25/32.	Magalingam Pillai	143, 341 and 506, I.P.C.	Apology.
102. Do. ..	Do.	Sathayya Pillai	Do.	Do.
103. Do. ..	Do.	Narayanaswami Pillai ..	Do.	Do.
104. Do. ..	Do.	Gnanasundaram Tevar ..	Do.	Do.
105. Do. ..	Do.	Kolandaivelu Asari	Do.	Do.
106. Do. ..	Do.	Ramachandra Nayudu ..	Do.	Do.
107. Do. ..	Do.	Maruda Pathar	Do	Do.
108. Do. ..	Do.	Ramanadha Ayyar	Do.	Do.
109. Do. ..	Do.	Swaminatha Padayachi ..	Do.	Do.
110. Do. ..	Do.	Sundara Mudaliyar	Do.	Do.
111. Tinnevelly.	Subdivisional Magistrate, Tinnevelly, 21/32.	Kandaswami Pillai	143 and 117, I.P.C.	Do.
112. Do.	Do.	Alwarappan Pillai	4 of Ord. V and 17 (1), Crl.L.A.A.	Do.
113. Do.	Stationary Sub-Magistrate, Tinnevelly, 419/32.	Sankara Kone	413, I.P.C. and 17 (1), Crl.L.A.A.	Do.
114. Do.	589/32.	Ratna Raja Asari	Do.	Do.
115. Do.	Sub-Magistrate, Palamcottah, 173/32.	Solimuhtu Kone	17 (1), Crl.L.A.A.	Do.
116. Do.	Stationary Sub-Magistrate, Tinnevelly, 557/32.	Ramayya Kone	336, I.P.C.	Do.
117. Do.	583/32.	Chockalingam Chettiyar ..	17 (1), Crl L.A.A.	Do
118. Trichinopoly.	Joint Magistrate, Karur, 8/32.	Pariyaswami Pillai	17 (1), Crl.L.A.A. and 4 of Ord. V/32.	Do
119. Do.	Do.	Ammu Rao	Do.	Do.
120. Do.	Do.	Amritam Pillai	Do.	Do.
121. Do.	Do.	Viramalai Pillai	Do.	Do.
122. Do.	Do.	Manickam Chetti	Do.	Do.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office

...TURAL COLLEGE AND RESEARCH INSTITUTE L...
No. 29308
19 SEP 1933